DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 279 422 PS 016 375

TITLE	Class Size in Kindergarten through Grade Three: A Report to the Minnesota Legislature.
INSTITUTION	Minnesota State Dept. of Education, St. Paul.
PUB DATE	Jan 87
NOTE	104p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Class Size; Educational Finance; Educational Improvement; *Elementary School Curriculum; Feasibility Studies; *Kindergarten; Literature Reviews; Mathematics Instruction; *Primary Education; Reading Instruction; School Districts; *Teacher Student Ratio; Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS	*Minnesota

ABSTRACT

Reported are the findings of a legislatively mandated study on reducing certain class sizes of grades kindergarten through three to an optimum pupil-teacher ratio for Minnesota's schools. This report, after defining terms, briefly surveys variables affected by class size, such as teaching processes and classroom climate. Research is subsequently placed in its historical context prior to a review of the findings of the two major groups contributing to the literature in the last decade (Glass and Smith, and the Educational Research Services, Inc. surveys) and three selected projects from Indiana, Tennessee, and Chicago, Illinois, that have statewide implications for Minnesota. Optimum class size in Minnesota is discussed through a review of research, public and professional opinion, and current practices in the 50 States. Discussion next addresses the legislature's request for information on the number of teachers required to reduce the size of reading, writing, and mathematics classes. This topic is discussed within the context of the State Board's new elementary rule, effective 1986-87, requiring that specific proportions of time be given to instruction in certain curriculum areas. The feasibility of reducing class sizes to an optimum pupil-teacher ratio in individual school districts is explored in a trend-revealing 2-year comparison of class sizes. Concluding remarks focus on alternatives to small classes. Related materials are appended: references to research, Minnesota class size data for 1985-86, and projected 1987-88 revenues for Minnesota's school districts. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED279422

CLASS SIZE IN KINDERGARTEN THROUGH GRADE THREE:

A Report to the Minnesota Legislature

January 1987

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Corinna Moncada
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Minnesota Department of Education
Division of Instructional Effectiveness
Instructional Design Section
550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, MN 55101

PS 016375

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Legislative Charge:

K-3 CLASS SIZE STUDY

The department of education shall conduct a study on reducing certain class sizes of grades kindergarten through three to an optimum pupil-teacher ratio in Minnesota. The study shall address at least the following:

- o determining the number of teachers which would be required to reduce class sizes to an optimum pupil-teacher ratio in those grades in the areas of reading, writing, and mathematics;
- o examining the feasibility of individual school districts to reduce class sizes to an optimum pupil-teacher ratio;
- o and evaluating the existing research on the impact of reducing class sizes.

Table of Contents

Legislative Charge.....i

Introduction.....1

Definitions.....2

Issues Surrounding Class Size.....3

Background.....5

- Glass and Smith Research.....5
- Educational Research Services, Inc.....6
- Comparisons.....6
- Next Works of ERS and of Glass and Smith.....7
- Implications for this Report.....8

Reviews of Research on Class Size.....9

- A. Glass and Smith.....9
- B. ERS: Robinson and Wittebols.....10
- Other Research Projects.....12

An Optimum Class Size in Minnesota.....16

- Research Findings.....16
- Opinions.....17
- Practice.....18

Reading, Writing and Mathematics.....20

- The Elementary Rule.....20
- Implications of Reduction in Class Size for Reading, Writing and Mathematics.....22

Feasibility for Individual School Districts.....23

- Minnesota Class Size in Kindergarten.....24
- Minnesota Class Size in First Grade.....25
- Minnesota Class Size in Second Grade.....26
- Minnesota Class Size in Third Grade.....27
- Average Class Size and Teacher Salary by ECSU Regions for District Enrollments of Under 750 and Over 750 Pupils.....28
- Metro ECSU K-3 Class Size Averages.....30
- Metro ECSU K-3 Class Size Ranges.....32

Alternatives to Small Classes.....36

Alternatives to the Traditional Classroom.....36
Effects of Ability Grouping.....38
Individual Student Contacts.....38
Appropriate Strategies for Each Situation.....39
Pedagogical Effects of Reducing Class Size.....39
Developmentally Appropriate Curriculum.....40
Staff Development.....41

Summary and Recommendations.....42

The Effect of Class Size on Learning.....42
A Recommendation.....43
A Consideration.....44

References.....45

Appendix A

Twenty-Two References on Class Size in Grades K-3: ERS, Robinson and Wittebols, 1986.....A-1

Appendix B

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size--1985-86: Minnesota Public Schools.....B-1

Appendix C

Comparison of Projected 1987-88 Revenues for Minnesota School Districts Based on Current Pupil Unit Weightings and a Potential Weighting of 1.2 Pupil Units for Grades 1-12 and .6 Pupil Unit for Kindergarten.....C-1

Introduction

This report will define some terms used in the literature relating to class size. It will survey briefly the scope of variables that can be affected by class size: cost, teaching processes and classroom climate.

Before evaluating the existing literature on the effect of reducing class size, this report will place the research in a context to explain why this body of research is so extensive and so differently analyzed by professionals. Following this, there will be a review of the findings of the two major groups that have contributed to the literature in the last decade. In addition to these two research efforts, three selected projects that have statewide implications will be presented.

Next the idea of an optimum class size in Minnesota will be discussed through a review of what the research literature says on this topic, what the public and professional opinion is on optimum class size, and finally what the current practice reflects within the fifty states.

The legislative interest in allocation of professional staff to reduce class size for instruction in three of the subject areas required in elementary schools will be discussed next. This section will place these subject areas in context within the curriculum.

The feasiblity of individual school districts reducing class size to an optimum size will be analyzed through the use of data obtained from the Minnesota Department of Education from school districts as part of the fall report and the teacher licensure report. Additional information on salaries and class size in Minnesota regions will be presented. The Metropolitan Educational Cooperative Service Unit produces a class size study yearly, and sections of which will be adapted and shown in tables. The appendix will contain a more detailed analysis of the data from the districts.

A section has been included on alternatives to small classes. This section gives consideration to other restructuring alternatives that have been reported in the literature.

Some recommendations conclude this report.

Definitions

Although specific definitions are reported in the literature distinguishing among the terms class size, pupil-teacher ratio, student-staff ratio, and class load, this study assumes that the language of the Minnesota law requesting a study on "class size" and "pupil-teacher ratios" used these terms as if their meaning was interchangeable. The following are two definitions of **class size:**

> **Class Size:** the ratio of pupils to instructors, or instructional group size (Glass, 1979).
>
> **Class Size:** the number of students assigned to a teacher for a period of instruction. In elementary schools, where one teacher directs all learning, it is the number of pupils for whom a teacher is responsible daily. In secondary schools or other schools in which teachers are responsible for instruction in a particular subject, it is the number of pupils for whom a teacher is responsible during a single period (New York State Teachers' Association (1959).

It is these two uses of class size that the present report considers rather than other concepts defined in the literature.

> **Pupil-Teacher Ratio:** total number of students within a given school or school district divided by the number of full-time and part-time teachers in that school or district (ERS, 1978, p. 2).
>
> **Student-Staff Ratio:** the number of pupils in a school or school system divided by the number of all professional staff members involved in instruction or central office administration in that school. Instructional staff would include: teachers, principals, assistant principals, counselors, librarians, school nurses, and psychologists. Central office administrators consist of superintendents at various levels and administrators with supervisory capabilities (ERS, 1978, p. 2).
>
> **Class Load:** the number of pupils for whom teachers are responsible daily where the teacher assigned more than one class each day (New York Teachers' Association, 1959).

Issues Surrounding Class Size

The effect of class size on a number of factors is discussed in the research literature:

Cost

Student Achievement

Teaching Processes

Teacher Knowledge of the Student

Method of Instruction

Interpersonal Relations in the Classroom

Classroom Activities: Question/answer opportunities, use of manipulative materials, etc.

Self-Concept of Student

Classroom Conditions

Teacher Morale

Classroom Environment

Discipline, Behavior

The cost factor will not be discussed in any depth in this report. It is a core issue, however, that surrounds any discussion of class size. Rehmus and Wilner state:

> " A simple example makes the point. Reduction of average class size from 30 to a negotiated maximum of 25 students in a class would result in a 16 and 2/3 percent increase in teacher salary cost (Rehmus & Wilner, 1968, p. 19)."

Bain suggests a hidden cost in large class sizes:

> "Many policy groups, grappling with rampant costs, reject out-of-hand a significant reduction in class size as too costly for public schools. This perception of cost fails to consider potential savings if, as a result of small classes, students did not have to repeat grades later on. Or savings that could accrue if there were fewer dropouts, less truancy, fewer discipline problems,

and reduced future welfare payments (Bain, 1986, pp. 1-2)."

Lindbloom (1976) shows that prior to 1950 most studies of class size focused on its effect on achievement or promotion. He states: "In recent years the research focus has shifted toward an interest in the criterion variables of the 'teaching process' and 'desirable classroom conditions' (Lindbloom, 1976, p. 364)." An earlier review of the research literature by Lindbloom (1970) showed that the research support for smaller classes came from the studies on teaching process rather than on pupil achievement.

Background

Class size has been studied from 1895 until the present. Furno and Collins in 1967 reported over 300 studies.

A report from the Madison Public Schools (1976) records conclusions from two reviews of the literature that were current at that time.

> McKenna and Olson (1975) in **Today's Education** reviewed over 70 studies and concluded that: "students learn the basic skills better and master more subject matter content when teachers have fewer rather than more students (p. 39)."
>
> Heim (1972) from the New York Department of Education also reviewed over 70 studies and concluded: "...there seems to be little evidence to suggest that, within fairly broad limits, class size...has any general effect upon (achievement)...(p. 101)."

The Madison report notes that in addition to reaching different conclusions, these two reviewers had no overlap in the studies they considered. The Madison report remarks:

> "This fact is somewhat less suprprising, perhaps, if one recalls that the whole topic of class size is political and economic. It should be mentioned that the first review was published by a national teachers' organization while the second was the product of a group much more closely allied to school administrations. It appears that even reviewers of the research literature are biased (p. 7)."

The controversy has intensified since 1978, however. Since then, two groups have reviewed the literature and have been critical of each other's findings.

Glass and Smith Research

Gene V. Glass and Mary Lee Smith, visiting scholars at the UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation, in cooperation with two associates from the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development: Leonard S. Cahen and Nikola N. Filby reviewed studies on class size and quantified the characteristics to analyze them statistically. The results of their work are available in journal articles and in two documents

titled **Meta-Analysis of Research on the Relationship of Class-Size and Achievement**, 1978, and **Relationship of Class-Size to Classroom Processes, Teacher Satisfaction and Pupil Affect: A Meta-Analysis**, 1979.

The findings of this group of scholars are supportive of small class sizes -- the smaller the better. If one thinks of the practice of tutoring kings, the research of Glass and Smith would convince the reader that all children have a potential that could be realized through the intervention of a teacher.

While the message is clear and unequivocal in the Glass and Smith research, the statistical analysis that they used to obtain their results is technical and beyond the measurement competence of most educators to critique. Glass and Smith are academicians and statisticians. The major challenge to their work has not come from the academic community.

Educational Research Services, Inc.

Educational Research Services, Inc. (ERS) is an information source for the American Association of School Administrators, American Association of School Personnel Administrators, Council of Chief State School Officers, National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Secondary School Principals, National School Boards Association, and National School Public Relations Association.

ERS wrote an unauthored document that reviewed the class size research in a narrative, literary syle titled, **Class Size: A Summary of Research**, 1978.

The conclusions of the ERS report are inconclusive. It finds that "the cause and effect relationships are highly complex and interlocked with many other variables (ERS, 1978, p. 68)."

While the conclusions are not decisive in the ERS review of the literature, the reader has at hand a study-by-study narrative from which the reviewers gleaned their information.

Comparisons

The reader, then, is confronted with a simple message in an obscure package by the Glass and Smith research and with a complex message in simple, standard wrapping in the ERS research.

To the lay person, this process of scholarly attack and criticism can seem to disparage the findings of both groups. To a community of scholars, the process of critique and comment is the very vehicle for creating sharper, clearer thinking and perspective on issues.

It would be naive to think that only scholarship has been at issue in this intense debate. Once again, class size reflects an economic issue that brings vested interests of different groups into the interpretation of findings.

Glass and Smith state that ERS serves as an information service to groups that have historically opposed teachers unions in negotiations over salary and working conditions.

> "The 1978 ERS report on class size is in fact a dog's breakfast of pleonasms, confusion, and obfuscation.... (Their) conclusions - confused, garbled, and empty - counsel only inaction. This is rhetoric guaranteed to stymie decisons and leave people calling for more time, more research and no action (Glass, et al., 1982, p. 83)."

In 1978, ERS published a document titled **Negotiating the Class Size Issue: ERS Negotiation Aid for School Management.**

Next Works of ERS and of Glass and Smith

In 1980, ERS produced an unauthored document titled **Class Size Research: A Critique of Recent Meta-Analyses.** It stated that while Glass and Smith had used a technique that placed the reader in what Glass and Smith termed "benign jeopardy of losing qualitative and personal familiarity with the research (1978, p. 4), it also placed them in the 'benign jeopardy' of being unable to examine or evaluate the conclusions reached through meta-analysis (1980, p.63)."

ERS listed methodological problems with the research, they criticized the use of studies with class sizes as small as 2-5 students in the comparisons.

Glass and Smith asked ERS to debate the issue of class size. ERS responded that this was not its policy.

Glass and Smith reorganized their research, rewrote it completely and invited commentary on it from experts. They published this in a book titled **School Class Size: Research and Policy**, 1982.

Among those experts invited to comment from a policy perspective was Albert H. Quie who contributed a chapter titled "Class Size and Quality Education: A Governor's View."

In their 1982, book Glass and Smith provided a point-by-point rebuttal to the charges made by ERS. They had made a similar rebuttal in an article in **Phi Delta Kappan** (1980).

The latest document produced by ERS in 1986 is authored by Glen E. Robinson and James H. Wittebols. Robinson has been the president and director of research for ERS since the beginning of this feud. It is titled **Class Size Research: A Related Cluster Analysis for Decision Making**, 1986.

They repond to the earlier criticism by Glass and Smith of the ERS research conclusions by developing a document that "targets, groups, and regroups the results of class size studies into clusters of research findings related to specific, practical class size decisions (Robinson & Wittebols, 1986, p. 2)."

ERS does not acknowledge or counter the points made by Glass and Smith to their meta-analyses, but they review in the 1986 book the points that ERS made in 1980.

Robinson and Wittebols report that there were three extensive reviews of class size research in 1978: the ERS research, the Glass and Smith research, and an unpublished dissertation from St. Louis University by Frank Cone. They state:

55 entries were included in the ERS research

76 entries were included in the Glass & Smith achievement analysis and 40 more in the analysis on classroom processes, teacher satisfaction and pupil affect.

87 entries were included in the Cone research.

They add: "Interestingly, only 19 studies were listed by all three sources, and 73 studies were shared by at least two of the three reviews (Robinson & Wittebols, 1986, p. 10).

Implications for This Report

The particular area of this study does not fall into controversy between these two groups. ERS says in its 1980 document: "ERS finds nothing in Meta-Analysis I to change its conclusion that smaller classes **can** have a positive influence on pupil achievement in reading and mathematics in the early primary grades...(ERS, 1980, p. 65)."

Reviews of Research on Class Size

A. Glass and Smith

Glass, Cahen, Smith and Filby (1982) reviewed approximately 300 documents and eliminated half of them because they had no usable data. They classified the remaining studies into two groups: Learning and Affective Outcomes.

Class Size and Learning. The researchers found 77 empirical studies of the relationship between class size and learning. Within these studies they found 725 comparisons between small and large size classes. About half of these were studies of elementary classrooms.

From the 725 comparisons, 60 percent favored the smaller class. In 109 of those comparisons, the research methodology was better and subjects were randomly assigned to settings. In these 109 comparisons, support for the small class was even stronger, 81 percent of these comparisons favored the small class. Finally, the researchers separated the 109 comparisons on the basis of more than 100 hours or less than 100 hours of instruction. They found greater achievement gains when longer instruction was combined with small class size.

Class Size and Affective Outcomes. About 70 studies examined the relationship between class size and classroom process variables. These studies were found to have 371 class size comparisons which were categorized into 70 specific kinds of outcomes. The researchers then grouped those effects into three clusters:

Student Effects included: attitudes toward teachers, attitudes toward school or the class, self-concept, mental health, attitude toward educational program, motivation, preferences for class size, attitude toward life, participation in discussions and lessons, generation of and response to questions, interest and enthusiasm for classwork, attendance, study habits, student engagement, difficulty in learning, attention, on-task behavior, divergent or creative thinking, off-task behavior, apathy, friction, difficulty, dependence on adults, discipline, anxiety, good behavior, frustration, character development, peer group links, and student social interaction.

Teacher Effects included: teacher organization and planning, morale, attitude toward students, perceptions and satisfactions, workload, absences, and professional growth.

Instructional Effects included: teacher knowledge of students, amount of individual teacher-student interaction, number and variety of learning activities, amount of seatwork or student working on individual tasks, amount of work in small groups, teacher attention to individual students, adaptation of teaching to individuals, building foundation for independent work, conferences with parent, creative activities, dramatics, teacher directiveness, use of manipulative materials, amount of teacher control, positive teacher control, cohesiveness, friendly student-teacher relationships, freedom of movement in the classroom, student choice of activities, informality, social interaction, goal direction, creative instruction, use of teaching aids, general quality of instruction, amount of material covered, task structuring, positive evaluation, varied learning activities, innovation, general school climate, use of space, expectation for performance.

In the pupil affect category, the researchers found 172 comparisons, with 147, or 85 percent, of these favoring the small class. In the teacher affect category there were 30 comparisons with 25, or 83 percent, favoring the small class. In the category of instructional techniques, there were 155 comparisons and 141 or 91 percent favored the small class. The researchers conclude: "The odds are nearly nine to one that the comparison of smaller and larger classes will show superior affective outcomes in the smaller classes."

In their 1979 report on the **Relationship of Class Size to Classroom Processes, Teacher Satisfaction and Pupil Affect** Glass and Smith report strong and consistent effects on all measures. Reduction in class size is associated with higher quality schooling and more positive attitudes. These effects were most notable for children 12 and under.

B. ERS: Robinson and Wittebols

The ERS summary of research published in 1978 concluded that "There is research evidence that small classes are important to increased pupil achievement in reading and mathematics in the early primary grades (ERS, 1978, p. 69).

The 1986 review of research from ERS made use of a total of 55 studies from the literature. Robinson and Wittebols summarized the literature in separate clusters for grades K-3, 4-8, and 9-12 and presented them in chronological order.

Twenty-two studies pertained to student achievement in K-3 populations. All twenty-two studies made use of K-3 reading achievement comparisons. Fourteen of the 22 studies had measures of mathematics achievement. Four of the studies had measures of language arts. Complete references for the twenty-two K-3 studies cited by Robison and Wittebols are listed in the appendix.

The class size in these studies varies:

ERS STUDIES ON K-3 CLASS SIZE

Small	Large	Results	Researcher	Year
26	30	no differences	Spitzer	1954
30	36	small favored	Frymier	1964
20.1	27.2	no differences	Fox	1967
15	25	small favored	Castiglione	1968
19	20	no differences	Counelis	1970
30	40	large favored	Little	1971
14	31	no differences	Katzman	1971
26		no differences	Taylor	1972
		small favored	Heim/Perl	1974
		no differences	Murnane	1975
23/24	24/25	no differences	Madison	1976
24	28	no differences	McDermott	1977
19.9	26.7	small favored	Johnson	1977
20.5	28.1	no differences	Johnson	1978
15	25	small favored	Wagner	1981
19	30	large favored	Mazareas	1981
21	29	small favored	Carrington	1981
15	22.1	small favored	Doss/Holley	1982
13, 22	19, 35	small favored	Cahen	1983
14.1	23.1	small favored	Indiana	1983
15.1	25.1	small favored	Whittington	1985

The conclusions of Robinson and Wittebol are that "the grades that show the most promising effects of small classes on pupil learning are the early primary grades (K-3)." Half of the studies they cited found pupil achievement higher in smaller classes.

Some studies included in their review have limited relationship to class size and achievement.

Counelis mentioned under "other findings" that when he related monthly reading achievement of first graders to the class size he found no differences among groups which he formed by dividing the first-grade groups at the mean class size which was 20. He concluded:

> "There is undoubtedly some more intimate curricular factor, such as the number of direct instructional hours per pupil, which probably accounts for the differentials obtained (Counelis, 1970, p. 18)."

The study by Fox reports on one of the successful compensatory projects selected by American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences at Palo Alto, California under a contract with the U.S. Office of Education. The federal booklet **It Works** on the More Effective Schools Program (MES) in New York City says:

> "Fox...was responsible for an evaluation which based a verdict of no benefits chiefly upon a comparison of the same schools' reading and arithmetic achievement profiles before and after the introduction of the program. Fox and his team saw no consistent trend toward improvement. Forland and his associates... evaluated the program too, and reached the conclusion that reading achievement in MES was indeed superior if MES were compared longitudinally with control schools matched on ethnic background.... In the Fox evaluation, no account was taken of the changes of student population in New York, where mobility rates run as high as 75 percent in some schools....In the Forland...report mobility was eliminated as a factor (MES, 1970, pp. 8-9)."

Other Research Projects

Indiana. A basic skills program for the early grades called, Project PRIMETIME was established by the Indiana legislature with an appropriation of $300,000 for the biennium. Nine schools in 1981-82 were established with class size in twenty-four K-2 classrooms at a ratio of 14:1. These classrooms were compared with others at a ratio of 23:1 in the same rural, suburban and urban districts. Scores in reading and mathematics for the 1982-83 school year were reported in percentages of improvement over normal growth.

Indiana PRIMETIME Project Results - 1982-83

	Reading	Mathematics
PRIMETIME		
First Semester	54	62
Second Semester	61	53
Control		
First Semester	40	48
Second Semester	47	49

The report from Illinois (1985) indicates that the Indiana State Education Agency provided technical assistance to these districts. The report does not indicate whether both experimental and control groups received the technical assistance, but it is presumed that both. This would account for the greater than normal growth for both groups.

Students in the smaller classes had fewer behavioral problems and teachers reported they were more productive and efficient.

Baine and Achilles (1986) report that in 1984 the Indiana legislature appropriated $19 million to reduce class size in first grade classrooms around the state to a ratio of 18:1. The program began with first grade in 1984-85 and will include second, third and kindergarten in succeeding years.

The Illinois report (1985) states that the plan for reducing class size in Indiana is voluntary and provides a direct financial incentive for school district participation.

Tennessee. Tennessee State University received a grant in 1984 to study the effects of a class size of 15:1 in nine first-grade classrooms in metropolitan Nashville on the following variables:

reading achievement
mathematics achievement
behavior
attendance
self-concept.

A control group of first-grade children in Nashville was matched with each of the 105 experimental subjects. The entire district's first-grade children are another comparison group. Teachers are keeping logs on the teaching process and student behavior.

The project will continue through June 1987. Baine and Achilles (1986) report some preliminary findings:

- positive effects on teaching processes and student behavior
- significant gains in reading and mathematics scores

In 1985, the Tennesse legislature appropriated $3 million for a statewide class size project for 1985-86. Similar funding is anticipated for three additional years. The project is called Student-Teacher Achievement Ratio Project (STAR).

This project has involved 79 schools in 42 districts with at least:

one class of 13-17 students
one class of 22-25 students with a full-time aide
one class of 22-25 students without an aide.

The total sample has:

128 small classes of 13-17 students
99 regular-sized classes with full-time aides
101 regular-sized classes without aides.

No other intervention will occur such as technical assistance, staff development or special curriculum materials. The project will look at reading/language arts achievement, mathematics achievement, self-concept, attendance and retention rates. The educational background of the teachers and aides as well as their instructional methods, morale, and attendance will be studied.

Chicago's Government Funded Kindergarten Programs. Bridgman (1985), a reporter for **Education Week**, described a research project that took place in 1983-84 to measure achievement in half- and full-day kindergartens with large and small classes. More than 9,000 kindergarten children in 100 poverty-area schools were receiving federal funds through Chapter 1, Chapter 2, and the Office of Equal Educational Opportunity.

Observational research of 123 classrooms and interviews with 134 teachers and 800 parents were conducted. Bridgman reports:

> "Students in both full- and half-day classes that averaged 16 students scored, on average, at or above national standards for their grade level in language, word analysis and mathematics, and one month below their grade level in vocabulary.

"Children in full-day classes of 22 to 28 students on average scored above their grade level only in word analysis and below grade level in the other three areas.

"And children in half-day classes of 22 to 28 children performed at the lowest levels of all: They scored below average in all four areas and were found to be one year below the national norm in vocabulary near the end of their first year of schooling...(Bridgman, 1985)."

An Optimum Class Size in Minnesota

Research Findings

Vicent (1968) asked whether the class size/pupil benefit relationship was smooth and linear or whether there was some critical breaking point at which class size made a difference. He cites the Metropolitan School Study Council Commission on the School of 1980 which set an upper limit of 20 for the small class. He cites the research work of Woodson that used 22 as the upper limit for small classes. He says these were largely guesses.

Vincent and others at Columbia University conducted an observational study of 4,283 classrooms. Of these classrooms, 106 were grades 3-6 and 2,181 were grades 10-12. The indicators of quality that they used were: individualization, group activity, interpersonal regard, and creativity. Mean difference scores were obtained by subtracting observed negative indicators from observed positive indicators for classrooms at each size interval. Larger scores show a more positive environment. The scores from the elementary classrooms were as follows:

Mean Difference Score by Class Size Intervals for Grades 3-6

Number of Students in Class	Number of Classrooms	Mean Difference Scores
1-5	14	10.00
6-10	34	10.09
11-15	71	10.04
16-20	376	8.72
21-25	999	8.18
26-30	494	6.89
31-35	69	6.60
36-40	10	9.10
41-50	15	4.70
over 50	14	2.07

Vincent shows a breakpoint at the elmentary levels between 11-15 and 16-20 and again between 21-25 and 26-30. Vincent concludes: In the elementary school there appear to be three differentiations of class size:

very small = 15 or less
medium small = 16-25
large = 25+

Martin N. Olson (1971) reports on an expansion of that same study that was done in 9,961 elementary classrooms in 112 classrooms across the United States. His findings show the same breakpoints:

Elementary Observations Scored by Class Size

Size of Class	Number of Observations	Scores
Under 5	155	10.61
5-10	218	8.34
11-15	310	8.34
16-20	1,395	7.26
21-25	3,736	6.45
26-30	2,898	4.73
31-35	931	4.66
36-40	129	3.17
41-50	64	4.38
50+	94	2.22

Martin states: "...it would be well for school systems to consider altering their class size ratios if close to and on the wrong side of a critical breakpoint.... (Martin, 1971, p. 64-65)."

Glass and Smith (1978) reported that their research showed a trend for small achievement advantages for class size reductions in the 20-30 pupil range and large advantages when class size is reduced below 20. Their strongest findings were based on groups of 15 or less.

Opinions

Kleve (1976) reviewed the class size rules for elementary and secondary education at the request of the Minnesota State Board of Education. Kleve surveyed professional organizations on maximum class size and reported responses from the following elementary organizations:

1. Minnesota Association for Childhood Education - idealistic 20, realistic 25
2. Minnesota Federation of Teachers - less than 25 with a desirable goal of 15 in elementary grades

3. Minnesota Congress of Parents, Teachers and Students
   Resolutions adopted in 1975:
   - set a classroom ratio of 25:1 with lower ratio if a combination grade is involved.
   - appropriated funds to encourage and support reduced class size in kindergarten through third grade, primary levels, where basic skills are an important learning function.

No action was taken in Minnesota to lower the maximum class size in 1976. In 1978, the MEA board of directors endorsed the goal of 15 or fewer students in the primary grades. In 1979, the incoming governor, Al Quie, recommended strengthening the K-3 program through lowering class size, but he did not commit himself to a specific class size for the primary grades.

The Minneapolis Star and Tribune conducted an opinion poll in 1979 which showed what citizens believed:

52%	children would benefit greatly by K-3 reduction of class size from 25 to 15
26%	there would be only a little improvement
21%	hardly any improvement
1%	no opinion

The National Association for the Education of Young Children, a professional organization with 53,000 members, has developed a statement on **Developmentally Appropriate Practice** for children 0-8 years of age. It states:

> "Implementation of developmentally appropriate early childhood programs requires limiting the size of the group and providing sufficient numbers of adults to provide individualized and age-appropriate care and education. Even the most well-qualified teacher cannot individualize instruction and adequately supervise too large a group of young children. An acceptable adult-child ratio for 4- and 5-year-olds is 2 adults with no more than 20 children.... Group size, and thus ratio of children to adults, should increase gradually through the primary grades (NAEYC, 1986, p. 14)."

Practice

Presently, Minnesota has one of the highest maximum class sizes of any state as surveyed in 1985 by the Illinois State Board of Education. The following

tables showing the mandated and recommended class sizes were adapted from their survey.

Summary of **Mandated** Maximum Class Sizes:
Illinois State Board of Education, 1985

States	Kindergarten	Grades 1-3
West Virginia	10, 20 with aide	
Indiana	18	
Vermont		20, 25 with aide
New Mexico	20	26
Texas	23	
New Jersey	25, 29 with aide	25, 29 with aide
North Dakota	25	25
Oklahoma	25	
Ohio	25	25
Tennessee	25	
Virginia	25, 30 with aide	
Hawaii	26	26
North Carolina	29 with aide	
South Carolina	30 with aide	
Kentucky	29	27
Louisiana	29	29
Minnesota	**30**	**30**
Idaho	40	23
California	33	32

Summary of **Recommended** Maximum Class Sizes:
Illinois State Board of Education, 1985.

States	Kindergarten	Grades 1-3
Colorado	15	20 with aide
Indiana		18+ with aide
Delaware	19	19
Missouri	20	
Montana	20	20
New Hampshire	20	20
Wisconsin	20-22	20-22
Massachusetts	18	25
Oregon	24, 24+ with aide	24
Alabama	25	
Arkansas	25	30

Reading, Writing and Mathematics

This part of the report addresses the request that the department of education **"determine the number of teachers that would be required to reduce class sizes ...in the areas of reading, writing and mathematics."** It is important to see this request in the context the direction elementary curriculum offerings are structured in the new elementary rule.

The Elementary Rule

In 1983, the Minnesota legislature required the State Board of Education to adopt rules establishing elementary curriculum requirements which would ensure that a minimum comprehensive program is available to all public elementary school students in the state. This new elementary rule became effective in the 1986-87 school year.

The rule has mandated the same curriculum areas that were in the former rule established in 1923, but it requires a particular balance among all of these curriculum offerings on a yearly basis. One-third of the required offering time is to be allocated to:

Communications/language arts, including:
- (1) listening/speaking;
- (2) **reading/writing;**
- (3) children's literature; and
- (4) language study: structure and meaning.

Another third of the required offering time is to be allocated to:

Mathematics

Art, including:
- (1) observing;
- (2) producing; and
- (3) valuing and judging.

Music, including:
- (1) describing sounds;
- (2) producing sounds; and
- (3) organizing sounds.

A final third of the required offering time is to be allocated to:

Science, including:
- (1) earth science;
- (2) life science;
- (3) physical science; and
- (4) process skills.

Social studies from local to global, including:
(1) anthropology;
(2) economics;
(3) geography;
(4) history;
(5) political science;
(6) psychology;
(7) sociology.

Physical education, including;
(1) body management;
(2) motor and physical fitness; and
(3) motor skills.

Health, including:
(1) personal health;
(2) mental health;
(3) growth and development;
(4) chemical and substances use and abuses;
(5) nutrition; and
(6) safety.

Two other curriculum offerings are required, and these are to be taught in the context of the other curriculum offerings rather than in isolation. These two are:

Environmental education, including:
(1) natural context;
(2) social context;
(3) valuing context; and
(4) action context.

Media and technology, including:
(1) equipment familiarity and use;
(2) materials retrieval, selection, and use;
(3) media production; and
(4) viewing skills.

A district may include other subjects in the curriculum as determined by the philosopy and goals of the district. These optional offerings, however, cannot alter the balance among the required offerings. Optional offerings may include such areas as:
world languages and cultures
play in kindergarten
industrial arts
home economics

Although the curriculum offerings are grouped to indicate their emphasis in a balanced elementary school curriculum, the rule allows districts to present content through every combination of curriculum offering to help students see the interrelationships among the subject areas.

Implications of Reduction in Class Size for Reading, Writing, and Mathematics

If class size were to be reduced for the three areas of reading, writing, and mathematics, it would assume a model of instruction that had a daily schedule with each of the curriculum offerings being presented for a finite number of minutes per day. In the public hearing process for the development of the elementary rule, there was much discussion about requiring minutes per day or week per subject. This type of schedule works well for administrative purposes and eases the allocation of specialists to programs and allows for scheduling of preparation time for classroom teachers. Districts are not required to provide preparation time for elementary teachers although many districts do allow time for it. Preparation time at the secondary level is required by state board rule.

Curriculum leaders throughout the country advocate that the language arts not be taught in isolation, but rather that they be integrated with one another and with the other curriculum offerings.

The kindergarten program has 150 minutes per day in one third of our districts to accomplish the breadth of curriculum offerings described above. In two-thirds of the districts, the programs are 300 minutes on alternate days. It would be impossible to organize knowledge for anyone by slicing these curriculum offerings into small, isolated pieces and serving them daily. An integrated day in the kindergarten can only be realized by the organizational skills of a capable teacher. When the day is fragmented by isolated times for music, art, physical education, reading, mathematics, or writing, scheduling runs the program rather than a knowledgeable adult.

In grades one through three the same problem would occur at a somewhat lesser level of intensity. For young children coming to understand the world around them, it is not self-evident that knowledge should be, or is, organized into the packages that adults accept as curriculum content. In the attainment of higher level thinking skills, the interrelationships of strands of knowledge becomes far more important than the discrete bites of information. It is far easier to test, however, those facts which are isolated and without context.

Feasibility for Individual School Districts

The legislature requested that the department **examine the feasibility of individual school districts to reduce class sizes to an optimum pupil-teacher ratio.** There are a number of ways to look at class size data from districts.

The first way will be to look at the number of students in classrooms K-3 without respect to the districts in which they reside. The reporting system for this information includes wide ranges of numbers from 1-712 as it is tied to the licensure of teachers. A few teachers may have responsibility for some limited aspect of a program in an entire school. The extreme cases were removed from this report. Only licensed kindergarten and elementary teachers assigned to grades K-3 who did not receive federal reimbursement were reported.

Some of the small class sizes shown in the tables are combination classrooms of first and second grade children, second and third grade children, or third and fourth grade children which are taught by one teacher.

This two-year comparison of class sizes seems to show a trend to a smaller class size in grades one through three and an increase in class size in kindergarten. It also shows the magnitude of the problem the state would have in lowering class size as Indiana is attempting to do to a 18:1 ratio.

Minnesota Class Size in Kindergarten

Number of Pupils	Number of Classrooms Year 1984-85	Year 1985-86
5	2	2
6	3	2
7	3	1
8	8	6
9	3	4
10	16	8
11	20	10
12	21	21
13	29	15
14	15	24
15	43	49
16	32	39
17	52	47
18	59	88
19	108	96
20	141	156
21	198	200
22	188	247
23	246	274
24	284	296
25	305	337
26	239	220
27	157	191
28	113	106
29	61	57
30	40	17
31	18	8
32	13	4
33		
34	4	4
35		1

Minnesota Class Size in First Grade

Number of Pupils	Number of Classrooms Year 1984-85	Year 1985-86
5	3	2
6	2	3
7	2	3
8	4	7
9	1	6
10	10	12
11	14	10
12	6	14
13	17	15
14	26	28
15	17	31
16	31	37
17	34	49
18	30	61
19	52	83
20	69	124
21	103	160
22	150	187
23	206	252
24	230	299
25	296	296
26	283	241
27	219	160
28	142	97
29	92	46
30	56	29
31	35	7
32	5	1
33	6	
34	2	
35	1	

Minnesota Class Size in Second Grade

Number of Pupils	Number of Classrooms Year 1984-85	Year 1985-86
5	3	4
6	2	3
7	2	3
8	4	5
9	1	6
10	10	18
11	14	15
12	6	18
13	17	27
14	26	24
15	17	25
16	31	24
17	34	36
18	30	42
20	52	68
21	69	76
22	103	126
23	150	176
24	206	232
25	230	255
26	296	282
27	283	212
28	219	168
29	142	113
30	92	62
31	56	35
32	35	11
33	5	11
34	6	2
35	2	

Minnesota Class Size in Third Grade

Number of Pupils	Number of Classsrooms Year 1984-85	Year 1985-86
5	5	5
6	2	7
7	4	2
8	4	8
9	7	12
10	14	12
11	18	16
12	14	23
13	24	21
14	23	26
15	21	38
16	33	35
17	37	35
18	35	50
19	41	47
20	36	71
21	75	88
22	106	156
23	120	198
24	170	230
25	206	262
26	219	185
27	219	195
28	162	139
29	123	92
30	97	40
31	59	18
32	28	3
33	19	1
34	6	1
35	1	1

The preliminary information seemed to show that the class sizes were larger in the urban and suburban areas. With this in mind and with the idea that cost might be a major factor in reducing class size, a report was compiled for the Educational Cooperative Service Unit (ECSU) Regions showing the average class size in relationship to teacher salary. This information was subdivided to show enrollments in districts with under 750 pupil and districts with enrollments of over 750 pupils.

Average Class Size in the table shown below is the total of reported class sizes divided by the number of classes reported. **Average Salary** is the total of reported salaries divided by the number of teachers reported. Kindergarten teachers' salaries were adjusted for the fact that some are part-time and some are full-time employees.

Average Class Size and Average Teacher Salary by ECSU Regions for District Enrollments of Under 750 and Over 750 Pupils

ECSU Regions	Average Class Size Kindergarten	First	Second	Third	Average Salary for Teachers
I & II					
Districts Under 750	16	19	19	18	$20,914
Districts Over 750	22	23	23	23	$22,809
III					
Districts Under 750	19	18	19	19	$23,418
Districts Over 750	22	22	22	23	$26,091
IV					
Districts Under 750	19	20	21	19	$20,926
Districts Over 750	23	24	24	24	$23,392
V					
Districts Under 750	19	20	23	24	$19,830
Districts Over 750	22	24	25	23	$23,070
VI & VIII					
Districts Under 750	18	19	20	20	$20,177
Districts Over 750	24	22	24	24	$22,208

Average Class Size and Average Teacher Salary by ECSU Regions for District Enrollments of Under 750 and Over 750 Pupils

ECSU Regions	Average Class Size Kindergarten	First	Second	Third	Average Salary for Teachers
VII					
Districts Under 750	21	23	22	19	$20,591
Districts Over 750	22	26	27	28	$23,116
IX					
Districts Under 750	20	20	20	20	$21,065
Districts Over 750	21	23	23	23	$23,125
X					
Districts Under 750	21	21	21	21	$20,825
Districts Over 750	27	23	22	24	$25,045
XI					
Districts Under 750	17	17	25	15	$21,192
Districts Over 750	23	27	26	26	$27,485

The table shown above indicates that both salaries and class sizes are larger in districts with K-12 enrollments of over 750 for all regions.

The Metro ECSU has done 22 annual class size study reports of the district patterns in their area. The current report contains the following cautions:

> "...it is tempting to interpret interdistrict comparison in terms of relationships which suggest cause and effect. The reader should be careful in making comparisons. Class size data among school districts will be different because of many factors including educational philosophy, school facility design, school district organization, economic stability, school district size, management methods, and utilization of specialists or paraprofessionals in conjunction with professional staff....the data reported simply descibe **what** exists, not **why** differences exist among the districts (Frenchick, 1985, p. 2)."

Information from two sections of the report will be adapted and presented here: average class sizes for K-3 and class size ranges. **Range** refers to the extreme high and low class sizes reported in each district.

METRO ECSU CLASS SIZE STUDY
K-3 Class Size Averages

District	Average Class Size			
	Kindergarten	First	Second	Third
Anoka-Hennepin - #11	25.55	25.52	25.47	26.33
Belle Plaine - #716	23.75	22.33	25.50	24.00
Bloomington - #271	23.91	25.94	26.33	25.24
Blue Earth - #240	21.25	19.00	22.50	22.33
Brooklyn Center - #286	26.75	22.60	23.50	22.75
Buffalo - #877	23.92	23.25	23.73	25.36
Burnsville - #191	24.45	24.14	24.30	25.04
Cannon Falls - #252	24.40	23.40	25.25	26.50
Centennial #12	23.21	25.17	25.58	25.92
Chaska - #112	23.20	24.50	23.00	27.38
Columbia Heights - #13	24.64	25.27	25.88	25.22
Eden Prairie - #272	22.28	23.41	24.73	25.69
Edina - #273	23.14	22.24	23.42	23.29
Elk River - #728	26.21	23.46	26.00	25.50
Farmington - #192	26.75	25.25	25.14	24.67
Forest Lake - #831	23.90	23.70	23.89	25.18
Fridley - #14	27.50	26.25	24.29	24.29
Hastings - #200	23.00	22.77	25.45	26.70
Hopkins - #270	22.41	25.00	26.33	26.86
Inver Grove Heights - #199	24.62	25.73	26.22	26.00

METRO ECSU CLASS SIZE STUDY
K-3 Class Size Averages

District	Average Class Size			
	Kindergarten	First	Second	Third
Jordan - #717	23.00	22.50	27.00	25.00
Lakeville - #194	22.18	22.70	22.90	25.40
Mahtomedi - #832	21.33	24.20	25.40	24.80
Minneapolis #S-1	24.41	26.00	26.77	26.33
Minnetonka - #276	21.40	25.19	24.92	24.92
Moorhead - #152	26.06	22.00	22.50	20.88
Mounds View - #621	24.10	25.75	26.10	27.12
New Prague - #721	24.14	23.00	26.50	24.50
North Branch - #138	23.25	23.63	24.25	25.00
No. St. Paul/Maplewood/Oakdale - #622	23.23	23.11	26.05	26.50
Northfield - #659	21.92	25.56	24.38	23.13
Norwood/Young America - #108	22.00	20.67	24.50	20.00
Orono #278	25.00	22.40	24.75	27.25
Osseo - #279	24.78	23.70	25.37	24.98
Prior Lake - #719	23.89	22.67	26.57	25.71
Randolph - #195	no data available			
Richfield - #280	25.62	23.67	23.25	25.36
Robbinsdale - #281	23.77	25.38	24.79	26.07
Rosemount - #196	24.11	23.60	23.98	25.07
Roseville - #623	22.57	23.16	24.13	24.50
St. Anthony/New Brighton - #282	26.67	23.33	26.50	24.50
St. Francis - #15	26.08	25.62	25.36	25.09
St. Louis Park #283	25.67	24.75	26.40	24.09

METRO ECSU CLASS SIZE STUDY
K-3 Class Size Averages

District	Average Class Size			
	Kindergarten	First	Second	Third
St. Paul - #625	22.97	25.41	25.77	27.06
Shakopee - #720	23.78	23.43	24.29	26.00
South St. Paul - #S-6	26.50	22.40	28.00	24.88
South Washington County - #833	25.60	26.83	26.50	26.78
Spring Lake Park - #16	22.13	24.23	25.17	23.92
Stillwater - #834	26.94	25.75	25.86	27.50
Waconia - #110	No data available			
Watertown/Mayer - #111	25.25	22.25	21.75	21.25
Wayzata - #284	25.07	24.41	26.00	26.43
West St. Paul - #194	22.18	22.70	22.90	23.00
Westonka - #277	25.86	23.89	26.14	27.67
White Bear Lake - #624	23.77	24.75	27.33	24.81

METRO ECSU CLASS SIZE STUDY
K-3 Class Size Ranges

District	Range of Class Sizes							
	Kindergarten		First		Second		Third	
	Hi	Low	Hi	Low	Hi	Low	Hi	Low
Anoka-Hennepin - #11	31	20	31	18	31	20	30	22
Belle Plaine - #716	32	20	24	23	23	22	26	25
Bloomington - #271	27	19	30	20	30	22	30	21
Blue Earth - #240	22	20	19	19	23	21	23	21
Brooklyn Center - #286	29	24	24	22	24	23	24	22

METRO ECSU CLASS SIZE STUDY
K-3 Class Size Ranges

District	Range of Class Sizes			
	Kindergarten Hi-Low	First Hi-Low	Second Hi-Low	Third Hi-Low
Buffalo - #877	26-21	26-22	25-21	28-22
Burnsville - #191	29-20	28-20	27-21	28-21
Cannon Falls - #252	26-21	25-22	26-24	27-26
Centennial #12	26-19	28-21	29-22	28-25
Chaska - #112	26-21	30-22	26-21	28-26
Columbia Heights - #13	28-18	27-22	29-24	29-22
Eden Prairie - #272	27-14	27-19	28-23	28-24
Edina - #273	27-19	25-20	26-22	26-20
Elk River - #728	29-22	27-18	29-24	28-21
Farmington - #192	28-25	26-24	26-24	26-24
Forest Lake - #831	28-19	26-19	27-19	30-16
Fridley - #14	29-26	29-23	30-19	26-23
Hastings - #200	26-19	26-20	28-23	29-25
Hopkins - #270	26-17	27-23	28-25	28-25
Inver Grove Heights - #199	27-23	30-24	29-24	28-24
Jordan - #717	27-20	23-22	27-27	25-25
Lakeville - #194	26-17	27-20	28-20	25-21
Mahtomedi - #832	22-21	25-22	26-25	25-24
Minneapolis #S-1	27-19	29-12	30-22	31-21
Minnetonka - #276	25-19	28-22	29-21	28-21
Moorhead - #152	28-25	24-21	24-21	25-16
Mounds View - #621	28-19	29-23	31-22	31-23

METRO ECSU CLASS SIZE STUDY
K-3 Class Size Ranges

District	Range of Class Sizes			
	Kindergarten Hi-Low	First Hi-Low	Second Hi-Low	Third Hi-Low
New Prague - #721	25-23	24-22	27-26	25-24
North Branch - #138	25-22	24-23	26-23	27-24
No. St. Paul/Maplewood/Oakdale - #622	28-17	29-14	30-22	30-24
Northfield - #659	24-20	26-24	25-22	24-22
Norwood/Young America - #108	21-17	22-22	21-20	25-24
Orono #278	28-22	24-19	26-23	28-27
Osseo - #279	32-20	26-21	31-21	30-18
Prior Lake - #719	24-23	24-21	28-26	26-25
Randolph - #195	no data available			
Richfield - #280	30-18	25-23	24-22	28-23
Robbinsdale - #281	28-17	30-21	28-22	31-22
Rosemount - #196	29-19	28-19	28-21	28-20
Roseville - #623	28-15	25-21	27-20	27-21
St. Anthony/New Brighton - #282	27-26	24-23	27-26	25-24
St. Francis - #15	28-24	28-22	28-19	28-23
St. Louis Park #283	30-20	26-23	29-22	26-22
St. Paul - #625	28-13	31-19	33-21	37-21
Shakopee - #720	26-19	26-22	27-22	27-25
South St. Paul - #S-6	29-22	25-20	29-27	28-22
South Washington County - #833	28-20	30-24	30-24	30-22
Spring Lake Park - #16	26-18	28-19	27-24	25-22
Stillwater - #834	30-22	28-23	30-23	30-22

METRO ECSU CLASS SIZE STUDY
K-3 Class Size Ranges

District	Range of Class Sizes			
	Kindergarten Hi-Low	First Hi-Low	Second Hi-Low	Third Hi-Low
Waconia - #110	No data available			
Watertown/Mayer - #111	26-25	23-21	22-21	22-21
Wayzata - #284	29-23	27-21	28-23	30-22
West St. Paul - #194	26-17	27-20	28-20	25-21
Westonka - #277	29-23	26-14	27-23	28-27
White Bear Lake - #624	28-17	30-20	29-24	29-21

The Metro ECSU study gives information in summary form and allows a glimpse of what life in classrooms around the state may be like at the kindergarten/primary levels. To get a complete picture of what is happening in Minnesota it is necessary to look at the total array of class size data from each of the districts. In the appendix is a report, **Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86: Minnesota Public Schools** which gives the class size figures for each of the K-3 classrooms by district.

Alternatives to Small Classes

The goal of education is to promote learning, and reducing class size has been shown to be one method. There are, however, alternative ways to promote learning, ways that can work with class size to give more power to the educational process.

Alternatives to the Traditional Classroom

Millard (1977) suggests some alternatives to small classes, but states that none of these should be adopted to increase the student/teacher ratio. Although Millard was addressing the problem of small districts having insufficient numbers of students per grade, these suggestions are alternative ways to handle large enrollments as well.

Non-graded school

This alternative would allow grouping of children according to their interests, according to subject matter, or according to achievement and/or ability. Children work together regardless of their age.

A non-graded elementary unit requires careful planning on the part of the teachers and a great deal of communication among teachers.

Multiage grouping

Students are grouped according to their age, e.g., seven-, eight-, and nine-year-olds might be grouped together. Students may be grouped temporarily with a smaller age range.

Pupil-team learning is practiced as a part of multiage grouping. This plan does not work equally well with all subjects or with all learners.

Teachers could team teach or work in self-contained classrooms with an age range of students.

Team teaching

Teachers need personal flexibility, cooperation and planning to team teach.

The best use of teacher skills in subject matter areas, ability to handle large or small groups, or in teaching styles can be realized.

Aides
Use of aides for non-teaching assignments

Differentiated staffing
The staff might be composed of a master teacher, a senior teacher, a staff teacher, an associate teacher, and teachers' aides.

Determining the appropriate duties for each level and assessing the teaching competencies for those levels is necessary.

Morgan Noli (1982), an elementary school principal, responds to the research of Glass and Smith with the following ways to reduce group size.

Paraprofessionals
Although some research does not advise aides in a direct teaching role, their value as monitors and clerical assistants is undisputed.

Parent volunteers and community resource persons, including student interns.

Staggered schedule
Half of the students come to school early and have individualized instruction until the rest of the class comes. The other half of the class stays later in the day for individualized instruction.

This alternative requires changes in the busing schedule.

Pull-out programs
Under the supervision of one or more resource teachers, students are sent out of the class while the teacher works with a smaller group.

Team teaching
Teachers and aides with responsibilities for a group of children will find a variety of ways to organize over the teaching day.

Extended day
The kindergarten school day is lengthened for one-fifth of the class each day or afternoons are used.

The primary grades extend the day for small groups with similar needs.

This requires changes in the teacher contract and additional busing of students.

Kindergarten/First-Grade Combinations
Small groups or stations are used in the morning when the kindergarten children are present. The first-grade group is small in the afternoons.

All credentialed staff teach reading
This requires inservice training for all staff.

A Support Team Rotates to Classrooms
Group size is reduced for a single subject by a team coming to the classroom each day.

Effects of Ability Grouping

Hallinan and Sorensen (1984) hypothesized that the amount of learning that takes place in classrooms is related to the quantity and quality of instruction. They chose 26 classes in the 24-37 student range. They looked at growth in reading and mathematics and found that size had a negative effect on achievement in all of the classes. In large classes where teachers did not subgroup students for instruction, class size had no significant effect on learning. The authors state that this is consistent with the findings of Glass and Smith that classes of 30-60 were not superior in achievement to classes of 60+. The effect of ability grouping students for instruction in large classes, however, was a disadvantage to slower students. The larger the ability groups were, the smaller was the growth in reading and mathematics achievement over a school year.

Individual Student Contacts

New York State teachers suggest a measure of the minimum individual student contact time as an alternative to class size. In a class of 25 students which meets daily for five hours, each student, theoretically, receives one student hour per week of instruction or 12 student minutes per day. To guarantee each pupil 14 minutes per day, rather than 12, the class would be limited to approximately 21 students per class to reach that standard. Minnesota kindergarten students in a class of 30 would receive five minutes per day of teacher time.

While the teacher is considered the appropriate person to give contact to individual students in the model cited above, Bronfenbrenner is also deeply concerned about the needs of children for contact with other human beings. He states:

"...any appreciable, enduring improvement in the child's development can be effected only through an appreciable, enduring change in the environment and behavior of the persons intimately associated with the child on a day-to-day basis (Bronfenbrenner, 1970, p. 142)."

With this in mind, Bronfenbrenner suggests that the role of the teacher is to be a motivating model. But it is also the responsibility of the teacher to "...seek out, organize, develop and coordinate the activities of other appropriate models and reinforcing agents both within the classroom and outside." Far-reaching innovations are required to help teachers discover, recruit, and utilize individuals and groups from outside the school as major adjuncts to the educational process, according to Bronfenbrenner.

Appropriate Strategies for Each Situation

Lindbloom (1976) considers that the concepts of teacher and class have become fluid and stretched beyond the traditional classroom. He states:

"With staffing patterns, instructional groups, and learning facilities becoming more variable and defined more broadly, we must learn to state instructional goals and objectives in terms of student-measurable outcomes. To achieve the multiple objectives of providing growth in the social, emotional, physical, attitudinal, and cognitive areas, one must determine methodology, size of learning group, instructional personnel, and facilities. The learning objective may demand an independent study or a small group discussion. It may call for a group of 500 viewing TV monitors, or a lab course for six at a local hospital. A local banker, university professor, a parent, or a fellow student may be part of the instructional team (Lindbloom, 1976, p. 366)."

Pedagogical Effects of Reducing Class Size

Hamilton (1983) suggests that class size has focused on issues of **quantity and products.** Therefore, questions revolve around how great an investment in human resources is necessary to affect a change in pupils' skill level. The research of Glass and Smith shows that lowering class size may result in a change in pedagogy. A realignment of teaching, learning and curriculum would constitute a pedagogical change relating to **quality and process.**

Hamilton (1983) suggests two ways to look at pedagogy:

Closed or Imitative Pedagogy.

Curriculum is socially significant human experience coded in an educational form (e.g., lists of objectives) and merely passed on to the next generation.

Teaching is the decoding of this curriculum by teachers who unlock the storehouse of experience.

Learners reencode the curriculum through mimicking such prior experience.

Open or Creative Pedagogy.

Curriculum is an educational tool that teachers actively wield rather than raw material that teachers passively consume. The curriculum is a catylsts interacting with teaching and learning.

Teaching gives the learner the principles of key-making, rather than unlocking a storehouse of information. The result of teaching is that the learner knows how to learn.

Learning makes use of the teacher as one of the raw materials or tools of learning. Students, too, are raw materials or tools of learning. The curriculum interacts with them and is brought to life by the strategies of the teacher and the actions of the student.

Developmentally Appropriate Curriculum

The **NAEYC Position Statement on Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early Childhood Programs Serving Children from Birth Through Age 8** sets out standards for curriculum:

"A. Developmentally appropriate curriculum provides for all areas of a child's development: physical, emotional, social, and cognitive through an integrated approach.

"B. Appropriate curriculum planning is based on teachers' observations and recordings of each child's special interests and developmental progress.

"C. Curriculum planning emphasizes learning as an interactive process. Teachers prepare the environment for children to learn through active exploration and interaction with adults, other children and materials.

"D. Learning activities and materials should be concrete, real, and relevant to the lives of young children.

"E. Programs provide for a wider range of developmental interests and abilities than the chronological age range of the group would suggest. Adults are prepared to meet the needs of children who exhibit unusual interests and skills outside the normal developmental range.

"F. Teachers provide a variety of activities and materials; teachers increase the difficulty, complexity and challenge of an activity as children are involved with it and as children develop understanding and skills (NAEYC, 1986, pp. 3-5)."

Attention to developmentally appropriate curricuum requires knowledge and skills on the part of the classroom teachers to plan and coordinate a program that is based on what Hamilton describes as creative pedagogy.

Staff Development

A smaller class allows teachers to adapt the curriculum and the learning style to the needs of individuals. Glass and Smith report that while many teachers use these opportunities, staff development is needed by others before they can make pedagogical changes. Lindbloom (1970) reports that Richmond found a three-year-lag in adaptation of teacher behaviors to small class size.

The experts highlighted above suggest a variety of alternatives for structuring schools and allocating resources. Many alternatives to a schooling model based on each teacher working alone in a self-contained classroom with a group of children of a common age are suggested.

Summary and Recommendations

Research supports the need for young children in kindergarten and in the primary (1-3) grades of the elementary school to receive more intensive and more personalized interaction from older children and adults to foster child-appropriate learning opportunities and humanizing experiences.

The Effect of Class Size on Learning

Student Achievement. The research of Glass and Smith supports the fact that greater achievement gains are made when students are in small classes. The research studies analyzed by Robinson and Wittebol show the most promising effects of small classes on pupil learning occur in the early primary grades.

Pedagogy: Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning. Class size has focused on issues of quantity and products. The research of Glass and Smith shows that lowering class size may result also in a change in pedagogy. A realignment of teaching, learning and curriculum would consitute a pedagogical change relating to quality and process.

Pedagogical Effects of Reducing Class Size. Glass and Smith report that the odds are 9 to 1 in favor of small classes having superior pedagogical outcomes. They found the most notable effects were for children ages 12 and under.

The Effect of Class Size on Affective Variables. Students are more motivated. They show less friction, apathy and frustration. Teachers have better moral and perceive students more positively. They feel more satisfied with their performance.

Small Group Size. Research does not support large groupings of young children, even when these groups have an adequate ratio of older children and adults. The National Association for the Education of Young Children states that an acceptable adult-child ratio for four and five-year olds is two adults with no more than 20 children. Group size, and thus ratio of children to adults, should increase gradually through the primary grades. An example might be:

Grade Level	Number of Adults	Group Size
Kindergarten	2	20
First Grade	2	22
Second Grade	2	24
Third Grade	2	26

A Recommendation

Pilot programs are needed which will demonstrate three things:

1. Greater numbers of adults and older children involved with the K-3 program.
2. Group sizes that range from 20-26 with two adults involved with the group.
3. A realignment of curriculum, teaching and learning to reflect a creative pedagogical process.

Grants should be made for planning and staff development to reduce class size. Selection of districts for grants will require that attention be given to geographic, rural, suburban and urban balance. Successful applicant districts would need to match the grants with new expenditures intended to:

1. Restructure the curriculum to reflect an integration of the required offering for elementary schools.

2. Develop outreach strategies to involve parents, community members, and older children in the education of the K-3 students.

3. Make use of technology to manage information on individual needs and interests of students and to develop a networking system for involving parents, aides, volunteers, and community resource persons.

4. Develop alternative classroom structures through approaches such as: nongraded schools, multiage grouping, team teaching, differentiated staffing, advisor/advisee systems.

5. Assure that a developmentally-appropriate curriculum is available for every child.

The pilot programs should address the quality of education that is being provided to students through use of some different options in teaching, learning and curriculum. Examples of alternatives to class size are found in the body of the report.

References

Bain, H., et al. **Small class size once again: An experiment in grade one, Metro-Nashville Public Schools.** San Fancisco, CA: American Educational Reserch Association Convention, 1986, (ED 271 196).

Bain, H.P. & Achilles, C.M. Interesting developments on class size. **Phi Delta Kappan**, May, 1986, 662-665.

Bridgman, A. "Class size, not hours, seen key in kindergarten." **Education Week**, 1985.

Bronfenbrenner, U. **Two worlds of childhood: US and USSR.** New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1970.

Counelis, J. S. **First grade students in the Hunters Point Bayview SEED Project: A diagnostic review.** San Francisco, CA: University of San Francisco, 1970, (ED 052 905).

Educational Research Service. **Class size: A summary of research.** Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service, Inc., 1978.

Educational Research Service. **Class size research: A critique of recent meta-analyses.** Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service, Inc., 1980.

Educational Research Service, Inc. **Negotiating the class size issue.** Arlington, VA: Educational Research Services, Inc., 1978.

Filby, N., Cahen, L. McCutcheon, G. & Kyle, D. **What happens in smaller classes? A summary report of a field study.** San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1980.

Frenchick, A. **Annual class size study, 1985-86: A report of class size patterns for the 1985-86 school year.** Minneapolis, MN: Educational Cooperative Service Unit of the Metropolitan Twin Cities Area, 1985.

Furno, O.F. & Collins, G.J. **Class size and pupil learning.** Baltimore, MD: Baltimore City Public Schools, 1967, (ED 025 003).

Glass, G. V. "On criticism of our class size/student achievement research: No points conceded," **Phi Delta Kappan**, 1980, 62, 242-244.

Glass, G.V., Cahen, L.S., Smith, M.L., & Filby, N.N. **School class size: Research and policy.** BeverlyHills, CA: Sage Publications, 1982.

Glass, G.V. & Smith, M.L. **Meta-analysis of research on the relationship of class-size and achievement,** San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1978.

Hallinan, M. T & Sorensen, A. B. **Class size, ability group size and student achievement.** Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Educational Research, 1984.

Hamilton, D. "Fewer but better? A scholar's view of class size and other educational research." In G.V. Glass, et al. (Ed.), **School class size: Research and policy.** Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1982.

Heim, J. J. **Variables related to student performance and resource allocation decisions at the school district level.** Albany, NY: Bureau of School Programs Evaluation, The State Education Department, University of the State of New York, 1972.

Illinois State Board of Education. **Class sizes for kindergarten and primary grades: a review of the research.** January, 1985.

Indiana State Department of Public Instruction. **Project prime time: 1982-83 report, November 1982.** (ED 239 765).

Kleve, G. L. **Class size study.** St. Paul, MN: Minnesota Department of Education, 1976.

Lindbloom, D. **Class size as it affects instructional procedures and educational outcomes.** Minneapolis, MN: Educational Research and Development Council of the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area, Inc., 1970, (ED 059 532).

Lindbloom, D. Class size: Is it an effective or relevant variable? In S.E. Goodman (ed.) **Handbook on Contemporary Education.** New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1976, 363-366.

McKenna, B. & Olson, M.N. "Class size revisited," **Today's Education, 64,** 1975, 29-31.

Madison Metropolitan School District. **Effects of class size on reading achievement in grades 1-3 of the Madison Metropolitan School District (1974-1976).** Madison, WI: Madison Metropolitan School District, Instructional Services Division. September, 1976, (ED 140 256).

Martin, M. N. "Ways to achieve quality in school classrooms: Some definitive answers." **Phi Delta Kappan, 1971, 63-65.**

Millard, J. E. **Small classes? What research says about effective class sizes and possible alternatives to small classes.** Ankeny: IA: Heartland Educational Agency, 1977, (ED 033 897).

More Effective Schools: New York City. **It works: elementary programs in compensatory education.** Washington, DC: U. S. Office of Eduction, 1970.

National Association for the Education of Young Children. **Developmentally Appropriate Practice.** Washington, DC: NAEYC, 1986.

New York State United Teachers. **Class size.** Albany, NY: New York State United Teachers, 1976.

Noli, P. M. **Implications of class size research.** AASA conference presentation. CA: Anaheim, 1980. (ED 184 237).

Rehmus, C. M. & Wilner, E. **The economic results of teacher bargaining: Michigan's first two years.** Ann Arbor, MI: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, 1986.

Robinson, G.E. & Whittebols, J. H. **Class size research: A related cluster analysis for decision making.** Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service, Inc., 1986.

Smith, M. L. & Glass, G. V. **Relationship of class-size to classroom processes, teacher satisfaction and pupil affect: A meta-analysis.** San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and development, 1979.

Vincent, W. S. "Further clarification of the class size question." **IAR Research Bulletin, 9,** 1968, (ED 034 303).

APPENDIX A

Twenty-Two References on Class Size in Grades K-3
ERS, Robinson and Wittebols, 1986

1. Balow, I. H. "A longitudinal evaluation of reading achievement in small classes." **Elementary English**, 46, (February) 1969, 184-187.

2. Cahen, L.S., Nikola, F. McCutcheon, G. & Kyle, D. **Class size and instruction.** N.Y.: Longman, 1983.

3. Carrington, A. T. et al., **Class size project 1980-81, final report.** Virginia Beach, VA: Virginia Beach Public Schools, August 1981. (ED 237 521).

4. Castiglione, L.V. & Wilsberg, M. **The reduction of pupil-teacher ratios in grades 1 and 2 and the provision of additional materials: A program to strengthen early childhood education in poverty area schools.** New York: Board of Education, 1968. (ED 034 003).

5. Counelis, J. S. **First grade students in the Hunters Point Bayview SEED Project: A diagnostic review.** San Francisco, CA: University of San Francisco, 1970, (ED 052 905).

6. Doss, D, & Holley, F. **A cause for national pause: Title I schoolwide projects.** Austin, TX: Office of research and evaluation, Austin independent school district, 1982, (ED 214 996).

7. Fox, D.J. **Expansion of More Effective Schools Program.** New York, N.Y.: Centre for Urban Education, 1967.

8. Frymier, J.R. "The effect of class size upon reading achievement in first grade," **The Reading Teacher**, 18 (November), 1964, 90-93.

9. Heim, J. & Perl, L. **The education production function: Implications for educational manpower policy.** IPE Monograph No. 4. Ithaca, N.Y.: Institute of Public Employment, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, June, 1974.

10. Indiana State Department of Public Instruction. **Project prime time: 1982-83 report, November 1982.** (ED 239 765).

11. Johnson, L. et al. **South Carolina first grade pilot project 1975-76: The effects of class size on reading and mathematics achievement.** Office of research report series Vol. 1, No. 116. Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Education, January 1977.

12. Johnson, L.M. & Garcia-Quintana, R.A. **South Carolina First Grade Pilot Project, 1976-1977: The effects of class size on reading and mathematics achievement.** Office of Research Report Series. Volume 1, No. 35. Columbia, SC: South Carolina State Department of Education, 1978. (ED 021 252)

13. Katzman, M.T. **The political economy of urban schools.** Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971.

14. Little, A., Mabey, C. & Russell, J. "Do small classes help a pupil?" **New Society**, 18 (1971), 769-771.

15. Madison Metropolitan School District. **Effects of class size on reading achievement in grades 1-3 of the Madison Metropolitan School District (1974-1976).** Madison, WI: Madison Metropolitan School District, Instructional Services Division. September, 1976. (ED 140 256).

16. Mazareas, J. **Effects of class size on the achievement of first grade pupils.** Ed.D. Dissertation, Boston, MA: Boston University, 1981.

17. McDermott, H.T. **The effect of a reduction in class size on achievement among first and second grade students.** Ed.D. Dissertation, Texas Woman's University, 1977.

18. Murnane, R. J. **The impact of school resources on the learning of inner-city children.** Cambridge, M.A.: Ballinger Publishincg Co., 1975.

19. Spitzer, H.F. "Class size and pupil achievement in elementary schools," **Elementary School Journal,** 55 (October), 1954.

20. Taylor D.B. & Fleming, M. **More effective schools program. Disadvantaged pupil program fund. Fund No. 97-16. 1971-72 evaluation. (Year 3).** Ohio: Cleveland Public Schools, Division of Research and Development, 1972. (ED 076 742).

21. Wagner, E.D. **The effects of reduced class size upon the acquisition of reading skills in grade two.** Ed.D. Dissertation, Ohio: University of Toledo, 1981.

22. Whittington, E. H. et al. "Effects of class size on first grade students," **ERS Spectrum**, 3 (Fall 1985), 33-39.

APPENDIX B

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Explanation of Report Format:

1. In larger districts, numbers in parenthesis report numbers of classrooms of the same size. In smaller districts numbers not followed by parentheses, indicate a single classroom.

2. Combination grades are connected by an ampersand. Small enrollments in the third grade may indicate a third/fourth grade combination classroom, but this information is not available for this report.

3. Federally Reimbursed Staff are listed under R. An Asterisk in the R column indicates staff coded primary but not federally funded

Ada - #521

K	1	2	3	R
21	25	20	22	15
21	26	30	23	

Adrian - #511

K	1	2	3	R
21	21	13	18	
24	21	13	19	

Aitkin - #1

K	1	2	3	R
14	17	19	18	20
26	19	20	19	20*
26	20	21	19	25
27	21	21		25
27	22			25

Akeley - #301

K	1	2	3	R
12	20	13	17	

Albany - #745

K	1	2	3	R
22	19	14 & 9		
22	19	15 & 9		
22	22	25	6	
24	22	26	11	
25	27	26	24	
25		27		

Albert Lea - 241

K	1	2	3	R
22 (1)	19 (1)	21 (1)	21 (1)	
24 (3)	20 (1)	23 (5)	23 (3)	
25 (5)	22 (4)	24 (3)	24 (3)	
26 (4)	23 (5)	25 (4)	25 (3)	
28 (1)	24 (3)		26 (2)	
	25 (2)		27 (1)	
			28 (1)	

Alden - #242

K	1	2	3	R
27	28	29	27	

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Alexandria - #206

K	1	2	3	R
17 (2)	15 (1)	22 (1)	15 (1)	10*
21 (1)	22 (1)	23 (1)	21 (1)	10*
22 (1)	23 (2)	24 (4)	22 (4)	10*
24 (1)	24 (5)	25 (4)	23 (1)	15*
25 (5)	25 (3)	26 (1)	25 (5)	45*
26 (3)	30 (1)			75*

Alvarado - #436

K	1	2	3	R
10	15	8	19	

Amboy-Good Thunder - # 79

K	1	2	3	R
18	16	16	28	
19	17	16		

Annandale - #876

K	1	2	3	R
19	24	24	22	
21	25	25	23	
22	26		23	
24	26		23	
24			25	
24				

Anoka - #11

K	1	2	3	R
22 (3)	18 (1)	22 (3)	22 (4)	15
23 (13)	19 (1)	23 (7)	23 (3)	24*
24 (16)	21 (3)	24 (18)	24 (10)	24*
25 (17)	22 (1)	25 (16)	25 (11)	25*
26 (7)	23 (8)	26 (17)	26 (13)	23*
27 (13)	24 (14)	27 (12)	27 (24)	26*
28 (10)	25 (13)	28 (11)	28 (4)	29*
29 (7)	26 (16)	29 (2)	29 (11)	
30 (1)	27 (18)	30 (2)	30 (2)	
31 (4)	28 (6)	31 (2)	31 (1)	
	29 (5)			
	30 (3)			
	31 (2)			

Appleton - #784

K	1	2	3	R
18	14	19	23	
20	15	19	24	
20	15	19		
		24		

Argyle - #437

K	1	2	3	R
22	6 & 8	19	14	

Arlington-Green Isle - #731

K	1	2	3	R
16	12	11	21	
24	27	22	22	
25	29	25	22	

Ashby - #261

K	1	2	3	R
26	21	17	22	

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Askov - #566

K	1	2	3	R
--	16	14	15	
	17	15	17	

Atwater - #341

K	1	2	3	R
24	24	19	25	
25	25	20	25	

Audubon - #21

K	1	2	3	R
12	--	33	29	
12				

Aurora - #691

K	1	2	3	R
22	15	22	23	
24	22	23	25	
24	22	23	25	
25	25	23	26	

Austin - #492

K	1	2	3	R
16 (1)	6 &	17	8 (1)	
17 (1)	14 &	6	12 (1)	
18 (1)	21 (1)	21 (1)	20 (1)	
19 (2)	22 (2)	22 (1)	21 (1)	
21 (3)	23 (3)	23 (2)	23 (4)	
22 (2)	24 (4)	24 (2)	24 (1)	
23 (3)	25 (3)	25 (2)	25 (2)	
24 (2)	26 (2)	26 (2)	26 (2)	
			27 (1)	

Babbitt - #692

K	1	2	3	R
27	28	20	25	20
27	30	22	25	

Backus - #114

K	1	2	3	R
12	10 & 10		23	
12	21			

Badger - #676

K	1	2	3	R
15	--	23	18	
			23	

Bagley - 162

K	1	2	3	R
18	19	18	17	
18	21	18	21	
19	22	18	23	
19	22	19	23	
19	22	19		
19		20		

Balaton - #411

K	1	2	3	R
19	14	14	22	
19	15	14		

Barnesville - #146

K	1	2	3	R
19	22	22	23	
19	24	24	23	
20	24	24	24	
21				

Barnum - #91

K	1	2	3	R
25	18	19	24	
27	19	19	25	
	19	19		

Battle Lake - # 542

K	1	2	3	R
17	15	13	12	
18		21	23	

Beardsley - #57

K	1	2	3	R
25	18	28	24	
25	19			

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Becker - #726

K	1	2	3	R
19	22	20	20	
20	22	22	20	
21	23	22	20	
23				

Belgrade - #736

K	1	2	3	R
29	22	24	17	
29	23	25	27	

Belle Plaine - #716

K	1	2	3	R
23	20	25	23	20
23	22	26	23	45*
24	23	26	25	
24	23			

Bellingham - 371

K	1	2	3	R
17	18	12	20	

Belview - #631

K	1	2	3	R
14	17	13	10	14

Bemidji - #31

K		1		2		3		R
11	(2)	19	(1)	18	(1)	18	(1)	10
15	(1)	22	(1)	21	(1)	25	(1)	
18	(1)	23	(1)	22	(1)	26	(1)	
24	(1)	24	(2)	23	(2)	27	(2)	
25	(1)	25	(3)	24	(1)	28	(3)	
26	(10)	26	(6)	25	(4)	29	(2)	
27	(2)	27	(1)	26	(2)	30	(1)	
28	(1)			27	(3)	31	(1)	

Benson - #777

K	1	2	3	R
21	18	24	20	
21	19	25	21	
22	19	25	21	
22	19		22	

Bertha - #786

K	1	2	3	R
26	21	21	25	
26	22	21	25	
		21		

Big Lake - #727

K	1	2	3	R
21	14	20	26	
22	21	21	27	
23	23	22	27	
23	23	22		
23	24			

Bird Island - #646

K	1	2	3	R
22	20	22	20	
24				

Biwabik - #693

K	1	2	3	R
18	17	15	11	
18	19	19	15	

Blackduck - #32

K	1	2	3	R
9	16	22	9	
9	17	22	20	
10	17	23	22	
10				
11				

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Blooming Prairie - 756

K	1	2	3	R
20	24	23	24	22
21	24	23	26	14
21	26			30
21				

Bloomington - 271

K		1		2		3		R	
21	(1)	20	(1)	22	(2)	22	(7)	24	(1)*
22	(2)	21	(1)	23	(3)	23	(3)	25	(2)*
23	(2)	22	(2)	24	(6)	24	(1)		
24	(8)	24	(3)	25	(2)	25	(5)		
25	(12)	25	(6)	26	(3)	26	(4)		
26	(2)	26	(1)	27	(4)	27	(2)		
27	(3)	27	(7)	28	(6)	28	(3)		
28	(1)	28	(4)	29	(1)	29	(5)		
		29	(3)	30	(1)	30	(3)		
				30	(2)				

Blue Earth - #240

K	1	2	3	R
19	19	21	21	
19	19	23	23	
20	19	23	24	
20	19	23		
22				
22				

Borup - #522

K	1	2	3	R
11	--	9	--	18*

Braham - #314

K	1	2	3	R
23	20	24	23	
23	20	25	23	
24	20	25	24	
26	20			

Brainerd - #181

K		1		2		3		R
12	(2)	17	(1)	22	(2)	12	(1)	
18	(1)	19	(1)	23	(1)	22	(4)	
19	(1)	22	(1)	25	(3)	23	(1)	
20	(2)	23	(4)	26	(3)	24	(7)	
21	(3)	24	(2)	27	(3)	25	(2)	
22	(4)	25	(4)	29	(1)	27	(1)	
23	(1)	26				28	(1)	
24	(1)	29	(2)			29	(2)	
25	(3)							
26	(3)							
27	(1)							

Brandon - #207

K	1	2	3	R
30	16	17	17	
	17	17	17	

Breckenridge - #846

K	1	2	3	R
20	20	19	23	
20	20	20	25	
20	20	20	25	
21	21	21		

Brewster - #513

K	1	2	3	R
19	22	21	19	

Bricelyn - #217

K	1	2	3	R
16	11	14	13	

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Brooklyn Center - #286

K	1	2	3	R
25	22	23	22	
25	22	24	23	
28	23	24	24	
29	24	24	24	
	24			

Brooten - #737

K	1	2	3	R
21	14	& 6	& 4	
22	19	15	& 5	
		18	19	

Browerville - #787

K	1	2	3	R
24	21	26	22	
24				

Brownton - #421

K	1	2	3	R
16	16	24	26	

Buffalo - #877

K		1			2		3		R
21	(2)	6	(1)	&	14	(1)	14	(1)	25*
22	(2)	21	(1)		21	(1)	22	(1)	
24	(3)	22	(3)		22	(1)	23	(1)	
25	(3)	23	(5)		23	(3)	25	(3)	
26	(3)	26	(2)		24	(1)	26	(3)	
					25	(5)	27	(2)	
							28	(1)	

Buffalo Lake - #647

K	1	2	3	R
26	16	21	23	

Burnsville - #191

K		1		2		3		R
20	(5)	21	(1)	21	(2)	22	(5)	
21	(2)	22	(5)	22	(2)	23	(3)	
22	(2)	23	(5)	23	(5)	24	(3)	
23	(6)	24	(9)	24	(2)	25	(2)	
24	(3)	25	(2)	25	(7)	26	(9)	
25	(2)	26	(2)	26	(4)	27	(6)	
26	(4)	27	(4)	27	(4)	28	(1)	
27	(6)	28	(1)					

Butterfield - #836

K	1	2	3	R
24	22	24	21	

Byron - #531

K	1	2	3	R
18	22	19	21	
20	22	19	22	
21	23	19	22	
21	23	20	23	
21				

Caledonia - #299

K	1	2	3	R
14	24	14	24	
17	24	21	24	
17		22		
17				

Cambridge - #911

K		1		2		3		R	
24	(2)	10	(1)	25	(2)	27	(2)	7	(1)*
25	(5)	12	(1)	26	(4)	28	(6)	15	(1)*
26	(3)	24	(4)	27	(2)	29	(2)		
27	(2)	25	(7)	28	(2)				

Campbell - #852

K	1	2	3	R
--	21	--	14	
			16	

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Canby - #891

K	1	2	3	R
21	14	21	18	
21	16	22	21	
21	17		22	
21				
22				

Cannon Falls - #252

K	1	2	3	R
23	25	23	24	
25	23	23	26	
25	24	25	26	
25	25	25	26	
26	25			

Carlton - #93

K	1	2	3	R
23	16	21	24	
23	18	21	24	
	19			

Cass Lake - #115

K	1	2	3	R
20	21	21	29	
21	21	21	29	
22	22	22		

Centennial - #12

K		1		2		3		R	
18	(1)	22	(1)	21	(1)	25	(1)	27	(2)
20	(1)	23	(3)	22	(2)	26	(1)	28	(1)
22	(1)	24	(1)	25	(2)	27	(2)	29	(2)
23	(1)	27	(3)	26	(3)	28	(1)	44	(2)
24	(2)	28	(1)			37	(1)		
25	(4)								
26	(2)								
27	(1)								

Ceylon - #451

K	1	2	3	R
13	15	18	17	

Chandler Lake Wilson - #918

K	1	2	3	R
19	25	25	23	

Chaska - #112

K		1		2		3		R
18	(1)	24	(5)	20	(1)	26	(1)	
21	(2)	25	(5)	21	(1)	27	(2)	
22	(1)	30	(1)	22	(1)	28	(5)	
24	(2)			23	(3)			
25	(2)			25	(2)			
26	(2)			26	(1)			

Chatfield - #227

K	1	2	3	R
14	26	23	28	
15	26	23	28	
15	27	23		
15				

Chisago Lakes - #141

K		1		2		3		R
24	(4)	25	(1)	25	(4)	25	(1)	
25	(2)	26	(3)	26	(2)	26	(3)	
		27	(3)			27	(1)	
						29	(3)	

Chisholm - #695

K	1	2	3	R
22	24	21	19	
23	25	22	19	
25	25	23	19	
26		23	21	
		24		

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Chokio-Alberta - #771

K	1	2	3	R
16	26	25	18	
18			26	

Clara City - #126

K	1	2	3	R
16	17	15	24	
17	17	15		

Claremont - #201

K	1	2	3	R
27	13	19	18	

Clarissa - #789

K	1	2	3	R
24	27	22	24	

Clarkfield - #892

K	1	2	3	R
21	20	16	7	
21	20	16	20	
			20	

Clearbrook - #161

K	1	2	3	R
15	--	23	--	16
				16

Cleveland - #391

K	1	2	3	R
22	19	22	16	
23	19	23	24	

Climax - #592

K	1	2	3	R
13	18	22	13	
14				

Clinton - #58

K	1	2	3	R
15	12	20	24	

Cloquet - #94

K		1		2		3		R
13	(1)	20	(2)	20	(1)	21	(1)	
17	(1)	21	(2)	21	(2)	22	(1)	
22	(1)	22	(1)	22	(1)	23	(2)	
23	(2)	23	(1)	23	(2)	24	(2)	
25	(2)	24	(1)	24	(1)	34	(1)	
26	(2)	60	(1)					

Cold Spring - #750

K		1		2		3		R
25	(1)	17	(1)	23	(1)	22	(1)	
27	(1)	19	(1)	24	(3)	24	(2)	
50	(2)	22	(1)	26	(2)	25	(1)	
		23	(2)			26	(1)	

Coleraine - #316

K	1	2	3	R
18	21	24	22	
23	22	26	25	
	22			

Columbia Heights - #13

K		1		2		3		R
18	(1)	22	(1)	11	(1)	10	(1)	
22	(1)	23	(1)	24	(3)	22	(1)	
23	(1)	24	(1)	25	(2)	23	(2)	
24	(2)	25	(1)	26	(2)	25	(3)	
25	(1)	26	(3)	28	(1)	27	(1)	
26	(1)	27	(5)	29	(1)	28	(1)	
27	(3)					29	(1)	
28	(1)							

Comfrey - #81

K	1	2	3	R
25	10	27	--	

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Cook County - #166

K	1	2	3	R
8	4	4	5	
22	5	5	22	
24	10	10	25	
25	18	16		
	20	30		

Cosmos - #461

K	1	2	3	R
25	22	18	18	

Cottonwood - #412

K	1	2	3	R
21	10	9	8	
22	25	23	22	

Cromwell - 95

K	1	2	3	R
24	27	26	26	

Crookston - #593

K	1	2	3	R
19	21	21	22	
20	22	21	22	
20	23	21	23	
21	23	22	23	
22	23	23	23	
23	24	23	23	
23	24			

Crosby - #182

K	1	2	3	R
16	14	15	13	
16	18	23	16	
21	18	23	21	
23	19	23	21	
24	22	24	22	
	23	24	24	

Cyrus - #611

K	1	2	3	R
21	--	--	--	24*

Danube - #648

K	1	2	3	R
14	15	21	22	
15	15		29	

Dassel-Cokato - #466

K	1	2	3	R
19	18	22	22	
19	20	22	23	
20	22	22	23	
20	23	23	27	
23	24	24	28	
25	24	25		
	24			

Dawson - #378

K	1	2	3	R
23	18	27	25	
24	19	27	25	
25	19			

Deer Creek - #543

K	1	2	3	R
18	20	17	19	

Deer River - #317

K	1	2	3	R
19	21	17	18	
20	21	20	23	
20	23	22	23	
20	23	24	24	
21				

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Delano - #879

K	1	2	3	R
23	22	21	20	
23	22	22	21	
24	23	23	21	
25	23		21	
	23			

Delavan - #218

K	1	2	3	R
17	--	15	15	13

Detroit Lakes - #22

K	1	2	3	R
21	18	20	20	
27	18	23	23	
27	19	23	23	
28	19	23	25	
28	23	23	29	
28	25	24	29	
28	26	24		
30		24		
31				

Dilworth - #147

K	1	2	3	R
21	20	18	21	
25	22	19	24	

Dodge Center - #202

K	1	2	3	R
23	20	24	25	
27	20	25	27	
	21			

Dover-Eyota - #533

K	1	2	3	R
19	8	19	17	
20	23	20	19	
20	23	22	19	
20	24			

Duluth - #709

K		1		2		3		R
15	(1)	11	(1)	11	(2)	6	(1)	
19	(1)	13	(1)	13	(1)	11	(1)	
20	(1)	15	(1)	14	(1) &	12	(2)	
21	(6)	18	(2)	15	(1) &	13	(1)	
22	(6)	19	(4)	17	(3) &	14	(1)	
23	(3)	20	(4)	18	(1) &	15	(2)	
24	(4)	21	(3)	19	(1)	17	(1)	
25	(12)	22	(3)	20	(2)	18	(1)	
26	(2)	23	(3)	21	(2)	19	(3)	
27	(5)	24	(5)	22	(4)	20	(1)	
41	(1)	25	(5)	23	(2)	21	(2)	
		26	(9)	24	(3)	22	(2)	
		27	(4)	25	(5)	23	(5)	
		28	(4)	26	(5)	24	(1)	
				27	(4)	25	(3)	
				28	(2)	26	(4)	
				29	(3)	27	(6)	
				30	(2)	28	(4)	
						29	(3)	
						30	(1)	
						31	(1)	

Eagle Bend - #790

K	1		2	3	R
27	10	&	9	10	2
	20		22	24	2
					6
					6

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

East Chain - #453

K	1	2	3	R
17	17	16	11	

East Grand Forks - #595

K	1	2	3	R
21	18	22	20	
22	19	22	22	
22	20	23	24	
22	21	25	25	
23	22	27	27	
23	23	27	27	
24				

Echo - #893

K	1	2	3	R
--	24	24	17	25
		24		

Eden Prairie - #272

K		1		2		3		R
14	(1)	19	(1)	23	(3)	23	(2)	
17	(1)	20	(4)	24	(8)	24	(2)	
19	(1)	24	(3)	26	(2)	25	(4)	
20	(1)	25	(6)	27	(2)	27	(3)	
22	(4)	26	(2)	28	(1)	28	(1)	
23	(5)	27	(1)			29	(1)	
24	(3)							
25	(1)							
26	(1)							
27	(1)							

Eden Valley - #463

K	1	2	3	R
16	20	23	21	
20	21	23	28	
21	21	23	28	
22	22			
	23			

Edgerton - #581

K	1	2	3	R
24	22	24	23	

Edina - #273

K		1		2		3		R
19	(2)	9	(2) &	10	(2)	20	(3)	
20	(2)	20	(2)	22	(5)	22	(3)	
22	(1)	21	(4)	23	(1)	23	(2)	
23	(2)	22	(2)	24	(1)	24	(2)	
24	(3)	23	(8)	25	(3)	25	(1)	
25	(1)			26	(2)	26	(3)	

Elbow Lake - #263

K	1	2	3	R
24	20	21	16	
25	20	21	17	

Elgin-Millville - #80

K	1	2	3	R
22	22	22	22	
22	25	22	24	
			24	

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Elk River - #728

K	1	2	3	R
23 (2)	18 (1)	14 (1)	14 (1)	15 (1)*
24 (3)	21 (2)	23 (2)	22 (1)	17 (1)*
25 (3)	22 (1)	25 (1)	23 (2)	25 (1)*
26 (3)	23 (1)	26 (3)	25 (1)	26 (5)*
27 (3)	24 (2)	27 (1)	27 (1)	29 (1)*
28 (5)	25 (3)	28 (2)	28 (4)	30 (2)*
29 (2)	26 (3)	29 (1)		
	27 (1)			

Ellendale - 762

K	1	2	3	R
16	19	20	11	
19	19	22	22	

Ellsworth - #514

K	1	2	3	R
10	20	18	17	
10				

Elmore - #219

K	1	2	3	R
18	19	24	19	

Ely - #696

K	1	2	3	R
20	21	19	23	
24	24	22	24	
49	24	23	27	

Emmons - #243

K	1	2	3	R
27	20	17	--	

Erskine - #597

K	1	2	3	R
12	21	17	12	

Esko - #99

K	1	2	3	R
24	23	20	22	
24	23	23	23	
24	23	25	24	

Evansville - #208

K	1	2	3	R
21	16	28	24	
	16			

Eveleth - #697

K	1	2	3	R
16	21	19	24	
18	24	21	25	
19	25	22	25	
19	27	23	25	
22				

Fairfax - #649

K	1	2	3	R
25	11	14	9	

Fairmont - #454

K	1	2	3	R
19	21	21	21	
20	22	23	22	
20	22	23	23	
20	22	24	24	
21	22	25	24	
21	23	25	24	
22		26		
23				
23				
23				

Faribault - #656

K	1	2	3	R
22 (1)	17 (1)	12 (1) &	8	25*
23 (2)	21 (1)	23 (2)	8	
24 (4)	23 (2)	24 (3)	9	
25 (2)	24 (4)	25 (2)	25 (2)	
26 (1)	25 (4)	26 (4)	26 (1)	
45 (1)	29 (1)	30 (1)	27 (4)	
50 (1)			28 (2)	

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Farmington - #192

K	1	2	3	R
26	25	25	24	
26	25	25	24	
27	25	25	24	
27	25	25	25	
27	25	25	25	
27	26	26	26	
28	26	26		
28	26	26		

Fergus Falls - #544

K	1	2	3	R
22	24	19	23	
23	26	21	24	
23	26	21	25	
23	27	22	25	
24	27	22	25	
24	27	22	25	
25	27	24	25	
26	29	25	26	
48	29	25		
48				

Fertile - #599

K	1	2	3	R
18	20	24	26	
18	21	24		

Finlayson - #570

K	1	2	3	R
15	18	20	21	

Fisher - #600

K	1	2	3	R
16	17	21	--	
18				
18				

Floodwood - #698

K	1	2	3	R
16	21	19	29	
16				

Foley - #51

K	1	2	3	R
24	26	23	26	
27	26	24	26	
28	26	24	27	
29	26	25	27	
		25		

Forest Lake - #831

K	1	2	3	R
19 (1)	20 (4)	19 (1)	13 (1)	
20 (2)	21 (1)	20 (1)	20 (1)	
21 (3)	23 (2)	21 (1)	21 (1)	
22 (2)	24 (3)	22 (2)	23 (2)	
24 (5)	25 (3)	23 (3)	24 (1)	
25 (2)	26 (6)	24 (1)	25 (3)	
26 (3)	27 (1)	25 (4)	26 (3)	
27 (3)		26 (3)	28 (1)	
28 (3)		27 (2)	29 (4)	
			30 (1)	

Fosston - #601

K	1	2	3	R
20	18	23	13	
23	18	23	26	
26	18	24	27	

Franklin - #650

K	1	2	3	R
6	7 & 8	8 & 10	10	

Frazee - #23

K	1	2	3	R
25	18	24	25	
25	23	24	25	
25	23	27	25	
	23	27	27	
	24			

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Freeborn - #244

K	1	2	3	R
12	19	14	13	

Fridley - #14

K	1	2	3	R
27	23	20	23	
27	24	20	23	
27	25	21	23	
27	25	22	23	
27	28	28	25	
28	28	29	25	
28	29	29	25	
29	29			

Fulda - #505

K	1	2	3	R
20	22	19	17	
23	22	20	17	

Garden City - #78

K	1	2	3	R
18	20	17	20	
19	21	20	20	
23				

Gary - #523

K	1	2	3	R
13	23	12	9	

Gaylord - #732

K	1	2	3	R
20	18	18	22	
21	18	19	22	

Gibbon - #733

K	1	2	3	R
23	12	20	15	
			15	
			15	
	23 & 15 & 30			

Gilbert - #699

K	1	2	3	R
27	17	18	19	
27	17	28	19	
		28		

Glencoe - #422

K	1	2	3	R
22	24	24	23	
22	24	25	23	
23	24	25	23	
23	24	25	25	
23				

Glenville - #245

K	1	2	3	R
13	21	10	18	
15	22	28	19	

Glenwood - #612

K	1	2	3	R
20	22	20	22	
23	25	21	23	
25	25	22	23	
25	26	22	23	
			27	

Glyndon - #145

K	1	2	3	R
27	20	22	18	
27	24		22	
	26		22	

Gonvick - #158

K	1	2	3	R
20	11	13	15	

Goodhue - #253

K	1	2	3	R
25	17	22	20	
25	17	24	20	

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Goodridge - #561

K	1	2	3	R
25	21	29	29	

Graceville - #60

K	1	2	3	R
27	22	18	28	

Granada-Huntley #460

K	1	2	3	R
19	21	17	16	17
19			16	

Grand Meadow - #495

K	1	2	3	R
18	15	19	28	
19	15	19		

Grand Rapids - #318

K	1	2	3	R
16 (1)	10 (1)	19 (1)	10 (1)	
18 (2)	15 (1)	21 (2)	19 (1)	
19 (1)	19 (1)	23 (2)	21 (1)	
22 (4)	20 (2)	24 (1)	22 (1)	
23 (1)	21 (1)	25 (1)	23 (1)	
24 (2)	22 (1)	26 (1)	24 (3)	
25 (2)	23 (6)	27 (1)	27 (1)	
27 (1)	25 (3)	28 (1)	28 (2)	
28 (1)	26 (1)			
34 (3)				

Granite Falls - #894

K	1	2	3	R
18	--	--	--	
20				
20				
21				

Greenbush - #678

K	1	2	3	R
20	18	16	16	
20	18	16	17	

Grey Eagle - # 791

K	1	2	3	R
29	24	26	26	

Grove City - #464

K	1	2	3	R
17	14	21	15	
17	16		21	

Grygla - #447

K	1	2	3	R
23	27	24	24	

Hallock - #351

K	1	2	3	R
20	23	31	31	
20			60	

Hancock - #768

K	1	2	3	R
21	23	21	23	

Harmony - #228

K	1	2	3	R
30	14	15	10	
	15	15	19	

Hastings - #200

K	1	2	3	R
8 (1)	20 (1)	22 (1)	25 (2)	
19 (1)	21 (3)	23 (3)	26 (2)	
22 (3)	22 (2)	26 (3)	27 (2)	
23 (6)	23 (3)	27 (4)	28 (5)	
24 (3)	24 (4)			
26 (1)	26 (1)			

Hawley - #150

K	1	2	3	R
18	25	24	27	
19	25	24	27	
20		24		
20				

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Hayfield - #203

K	1	2	3	R
22	19	23	20	
23	20	23	20	
24	27	23	24	
25	27	23		

Hector - #651

K	1	2	3	R
25	19	15	15	
	20	16	15	

Henderson - #734

K	1	2	3	R
25	27	19	29	
		19		

Hendricks - #402

K	1	2	3	R
25	11	13	17	

Hendrum - #525

K	1	2	3	R
22	36	16	18	
23		17	19	

Henning - 545

K	1	2	3	R
20	8 &	10	13	
23	21		22	

Herman - #264

K	1	2	3	R
15	19	26	20	
16				

Hermantown - #700

K	1	2	3	R
19	22	21	24	20
24	25	21	25	
24	25	22	25	
25	26	22	28	
		22		

Heron Lake/Okabena - #330

K	1	2	3	R
15	14	18	--	
15	15	19	--	

Hibbing - #701

K	1	2	3	R
21 (2)	18 (1)	18 (1)	21 (1)	
22 (4)	20 (2)	19 (1)	22 (4)	
23 (1)	21 (1)	22 (5)	23 (4)	
24 (1)	22 (4)	23 (3)	25 (2)	
25 (3)	23 (2)	24 (1)	28 (1)	
26 (1)	25 (1)	25 (1)		
	26 (1)			
	29 (1)			

Hill City - #2

K	1	2	3	R
26	22	28	17	

Hills/Beaver Creek - #671

K	1	2	3	R
19	15	16	16	
22	16	16		

Hinckley - #573

K	1	2	3	R
27	25	23	13	
28	26	23	28	
29	26	24	29	

Holdingford - #738

K	1	2	3	R
22	23	21	22	
23	24	22	24	
23	24	24	24	
23	24		21	
23				

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Hopkins - #270

K	1	2	3	R
17 (1)	23 (1)	20 (1)		
19 (1)	24 (3)	21 (1)		
20 (2)	25 (4)	24 (1)		
21 (1)		12 &	12	
22 (7)		13 &	11	
23 (4)		25 (1)		
24 (3)	13 &	12		
26 (3)	13 &	12		
		11 &	14	
		12 &	13	
		13 &	12	
		13 &	12	
		13 &	12	
		13 &	12	
		13 &	12	
	13 &	12		
	13 &	12		
	26 (4)			
	16 &	10		
		13 &	13	
		13 &	13	
		14 &	12	
		14 &	12	
	13 &	14		
	14 &	13		
	16 &	11		
	17 &	10		
		27 (1)		
		28 (2)		
	14 &	14		
	13 &	18		
	14 &	17		
	16 &	15		
		32 (2)		
	14 &	18		
	37 (1)			
			12 (3) & --	
			13 (1) & --	
			14 (3) & --	
			15 (5) & --	
			16 (1) & --	
			19 (2) & --	
			20 (1)	
			24 (1)	
			25 (1)	
			26 (1)	
			30 (2)	

Houston - #294

K	1	2	3	R
17	25	19	18	
18	26	21	18	
18				

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Howard Lake - #880

K	1	2	3	R
24	22	19	16	
26	23	20	19	
29	24	21	23	

Humboldt - #352

K	1	2	3	R
7	12 & 4		6	

Hutchinson - #423

K	1	2	3	R
24	24	24	24	25
24	25	24	24	
25	25	25	25	
26	25	25	25	
26	25	25	25	
26	25	25	25	
26	26	25	25	
26			25	

International Falls - #361

K	1	2	3	R
26	22	19	20	25
27	23	21	23	
28	23	25	23	
28	27	25	25	
28	27	26	26	
32	27	27	27	

Inver Grove #199

K	1	2	3	R
22 (2)	25 (3)	24 (3)	25 (3)	12
23 (1)	26 (5)	25 (1)	26 (2)	
24 (4)	27 (2)	27 (2)	27 (4)	
25 (2)	30 (1)	28 (1)	28 (1)	
26 (2)		29 (1)		
27 (1)		30 (1)		
28 (1)				

Isle - #473

K	1	2	3	R
23	17	9 & 10		
25	18	20	22	

Ivanhoe - #403

K	1	2	3	R
16	18	16	30	
17	18	16		

Jackson - #324

K	1	2	3	R
19	21	22	22	
20	22	23	23	
21	23	24	23	
22	23	25	24	
24		25		

Janesville - #830

K	1	2	3	R
24	22	23	20	17*
25	24	24	21	

Jasper #582

K	1	2	3	R
17	23	14	12	

Jordan - #717

K	1	2	3	R
21	23	27	24	23
21	23	27	25	
23	24	27	25	
27	25			

Karlstad - #353

K	1	2	3	R
18	28	26	17	
18			18	

Kasson/Mantorville - #204

K	1	2	3	R
21	26	23	22	
22	27	24	22	
23	27	26	23	
23	27	26	23	
	28		20	

Kelliher - #36

K	1	2	3	R
14	22	26	15	
15				

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Kennedy - #354

K	1	2	3	R
15	10	13	9	

Kensington - #209

K	1	2	3	R
--	20	22	19	
	21	23	20	

Kenyon - #254

K	1	2	3	R
26	19	23	26	
27	19	24	26	

Kerkhoven - #775

K	1	2	3	R
12	14	16	14	
22	23	19	18	
22	23	20	19	

Kiester - #222

K	1	2	3	R
17	22	22	18	

Kimball - #739

K	1	2	3	R
29	24	11 & 13		
29	24	26	29	
30		26		

LaCrescent - #300

K	1	2	3	R
18	21	21	23	
18	27	22	24	
24	27	23	24	
24	28			
21				

Lake Benton - #404

K	1	2	3	R
26	20	28	24	

Lake City - #813

K	1	2	3	R
22	22	22	23	
22	22	22	24	
23	23	23	24	
23	24	24	24	
24				

Lake Crystal - #70

K	1	2	3	R
22	20	19	20	
23	23	19	20	
24	23	20		
	23	25		

Lake of the Woods - #390

K	1	2	3	R
24	25	25	19	
25	26	25	19	

Lake Park - #24

K	1	2	3	R
17	20	19	23	
17	20	19	29	

Lake Superior - #381

K	1	2	3	R
13	18	12 & 7		
13	18	20	22	
18	20	21	24	
19	25	23	24	
20	25	24	26	
20	27	24	26	
21		24	26	
27		25	27	
27		25		
28				
28				

Lakefield - #325

K	1	2	3	R
14	12	19	16	15
15	12	19	16	
			19	

Lakeville - #194

K	1	2	3	R
17	20	7 & 11		25
20	21	21	21	
20	21	22	21	
20	21	22	22	
22	23	22	22	
22	23	22	23	
24	23	23	23	
24	24	23	23	
25	24	23	24	
27	27	26	25	
	27	27	26	

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Lamberton - # 633

K	1	2	3	R
13	24	22	19	
14				

Lancaster - #356

K	1	2	3	R
15	20	--	15	

Lanesboro #229

K	1	2	3	R
15	23	21	19	21*
15				

LaPorte - # 306

K	1	2	3	R
15	22	27	18	
16				

Le Center - #392

K	1	2	3	R
21	17	28	25	
21	17	29	25	
22				

Le Roy - #499

K	1	2	3	R
32	18	17	16	
	19	17		

Lester Prairie - #424

K	1	2	3	R
17	22	16	16	
18	25	17	17	

LeSueur - #393

K	1	2	3	R
22	19	25	23	
24	20	25	23	
24	21	26	23	
25				

Lewiston - #857

K	1	2	3	R
14	18	18	9	
19	18	20	11	
21	18	20	25	

Litchfield - # 465

K	1	2	3	R
23	13	23	22	
23	13	23	23	
23	20	23	24	
23	20	23	25	
24	21	24	25	
24	21	24	25	
24	21			
	21			
	22			

Little Falls - #482

K	1	2	3	R
20	20	15 & 8		
20	22	24	6 & ?	
21	23	25	21	
22	23	25	21	
23	23	26	23	
23	24	26	23	
23	25	26	24	
23	25	27	26	
24	26		26	
24	28		26	

Littlefork/Big Falls - #362

K	1	2	3	R
15	12	17	17	
15	15	26		

Long Prairie - #792

K	1	2	3	R
19	18	18	22	
19	20	18	24	
20	20	25	24	
20	25			
21				
21				

Luverne - #670

K	1	2	3	R
23	21	21	24	28
24	22	23	24	
25	22	24	24	
25	22	25	25	
		25	25	

Lyle - #497

K	1	2	3	R
24	27	25	27	

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Lynd - #415

K	1	2	3	R
18	13	19	21	

Mabel/Canton - #238

K	1	2	3	R
19	24	11	18	
19	24	24		

Madelia - #837

K	1	2	3	R
18	18	20	18	
22	19	20	19	

Madison - #377

K	1	2	3	R
25	21	22	21	
25	21	22	22	

Magnolia - #669

K	1	2	3	R
16	17	12	16	

Mahnomen - #432

K	1	2	3	R
20	19	11 &	5	
21	21		5 & ?	
21	21		19	
21			20	

Mahtomedi - #832

K	1	2	3	R
21	24	24	24	
21	24	25	25	
21	25	25	25	
21	25	26	25	
22	25	26		
22				

Mankato - #77

K	1	2	3	R
16 (1)	20 (1)	12 &	9	
17 (2)	21 (5)	21 (1)	11 & ?	
18 (2)	22 (2)	22 (4)	20 (1)	
19 (3)	23 (3)	23 (1)	22 (3)	
20 (5)	24 (5)	24 (2)	23 (4)	
21 (7)	25 (2)	25 (2)	24 (1)	
22 (6)	26 (3)	26 (3)	25 (4)	
24 (2)	27 (1)	27 (4)	27 (4)	
25 (1)		28 (1)	28 (2)	

Maple Lake - #881

K	1	2	3	R
28	26	27	20	
28	26	27	21	
28	26			
28				

Mapleton - #72

K	1	2	3	R
29	22	26	19	
30	23	27	19	

Marietta/Nassau - #376

K	1	2	3	R
9	10	--	6	

Marshall - #413

K	1	2	3	R
22	18	12	20	
25	19	21	21	
25	19	21	22	
25	19	22	23	
26	20	23	24	
26	21	24	24	
27	22	24		
27	22			

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Maynard - #127

K	1	2	3	R
18	25	15	23	--

Mazeppa - #809

K	1	2	3	R
27	23	23	20	--
	23			

McGregor - #4

K	1	2	3	R
10	24	14	11	--
45	25	18	21	
		22	23	

McIntosh - #603

K	1	2	3	R
19	26	21	16	--
19			16	

Medford - #763

K	1	2	3	R
26	24	27	22	--
27	24	27	22	

Melrose - #740

K	1	2	3	R
20	18 &	8	16	25
20	26	21	28	57*
22	28	25	29	
23				
26				
26				

Menahga - #821

K	1	2	3	R
20	19	32	20	--
21	19	32	21	
21	20			

Mentor - #604

K	1	2	3	R
12	12	12	13	--

Middle River - #440

K	1	2	3	R
25	21	--	--	19*

Milaca - #912

K	1	2	3	R
17	18	24	25	21
18	25	24	25	27*
22	25	25	26	
23	25	26	26	
23	26	26		
23	26	28		

Milan - #128

K	1	2	3	R
22	24	22	17	--

Milroy - #635

K	1	2	3	R
21	--	--	--	27
				27
				54

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Minneapolis - #S-1

K		1		2		3		R	
2	(1)	8	&	16		8	(1)	13	
11	(3)	8	&	21		13	(1)	15	
12	(2)	9	(1)	8	(1)	15	(1)	18	
13	(1)	12	(1)	10	&	10		21	
14	(1)	19	&	9		16	(1)	24	
15	(3)	24	(5)	15	(2)	17	(1)	25	(2)
16	(2)	25	(12)	18	(1)	19	(1)	48	
17	(1)	26	(14)	23	(2)	21	(1)	49	
18	(4)	27	(11)	24	(3)	23	(1)		
20	(4)	28	(15)	25	(7)	24	(2)	23*	(2)
21	(6)	29	(9)	26	(2)	25	(4)	24*	(3)
22	(11)	30	(5)	27	(13)	26	(5)	25*	(2)
23	(12)	31	(1)	28	(18)	27	(12)	26*	(2)
24	(9)	32	(1)	29	(12)	28	(14)	27*	(6)
25	(22)	52	(1)	31	(1)	29	(9)	28*	(17)
26	(30)			52	(1)	30	(7)	29*	(5)
27	(32)			60	(1)			30*	(4)
28	(15)							35*	(2)
29	(4)							48*	(1)
30	(1)							70*	(1)
32	(1)							80*	(1)
37	(1)							120*	(1)
60	(1)							150*	(2)
								480*	(1)

Minneota - #414

K	1	2	3	R
24	15	17	17	--
25	16		18	
25				

Minnesota Lake - #223

K	1	2	3	R
15	17	23	23	--

Minnetonka - #276

K		1		2		3		R	
19	(1)	15	(1)	15	(1)	22	(1)	20*	
20	(4)	17	(1)	23	(3)	23	(3)	22*	
21	(3)	22	(1)	24	(3)	24	(2)		
22	(4)	23	(4)	26	(1)	25	(2)		
23	(2)	24	(3)	28	(1)	26	(3)		
25	(1)	26	(1)	29	(3)	27	(3)		
		27	(4)						
		28	(3)						
		29	(1)						

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Montevideo - #129

K	1	2	3	R
20	19	21	20	--
21	20	25	21	
21	20	25	22	
22	20	25	25	
22	20	26	25	
22	21			
22	22			
23	22			

Montgomery - 394

K	1	2	3	R
25	26	20	29	--
25	26	21	29	
25	26	21		
25				

Monticello - #882

K	1	2	3	R
8	22	22	26	--
8	23	25	27	
24	23	25	27	
24	24	25	27	
24	24	26	27	
25	24	26	27	
25	24	26	28	
25				
25				
26				

Moorhead - # 152

K	1	2	3	R
22 (2)	21 (6)	20 (1)	16 (1)	21 (2)
23 (2)	22 (2)	21 (2)	18 (1)	
24 (3)	23 (4)	22 (5)	20 (4)	
25 (4)	24 (2)	23 (5)	21 (3)	
26 (4)		24 (1)	24 (4)	
27 (2)		25 (2)	25 (1)	
28 (1)			29 (1)	

Moose Lake - #97

K	1	2	3	R
21	16	24	19	--
21	19	24	20	
21	20	25		

Mora - #332

K	1	2	3	R
13	22	22	19	18
22	24	23	22	
22	26	24	23	
26		24	23	
27		24	23	
27		26	24	
			26	

Morgan - #636

K	1	2	3	R
19	23	25	19	--
19				

Morris - #769

K	1	2	3	R
24	23	24	17	--
24	23	24	25	
24	24	25	25	
26		25	25	

Morristown - #657

K	1	2	3	R
15	15	--	21	--
16				

Morton - #652

K	1	2	3	R
--	19	23	19	13
			20	13

Motley - #483

K	1	2	3	R
17	25	25	29	--
19				

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Mounds View - #621

K		1		2		3		R
20	(1)	11	(1)	& 13	(1)	14	(1)	23*
21	(1)	15	(1)	18	(1)	23	(1)	27
22	(5)	23	(1)	22	(2)	24	(1)	36*
23	(8)	24	(3)	23	(2)	25	(2)	
24	(5)	25	(7)	24	(3)	26	(3)	
25	(8)	26	(9)	25	(2)	27	(5)	
26	(5)	27	(3)	26	(2)	28	(6)	
27	(3)	28	(8)	27	(1)	29	(3)	
28	(2)	29	(2)	28	(4)	30	(2)	
200	(1)			29	(2)	31	(2)	
225	(1)			30	(6)			
404	(2)			31	(2)			

Mountain Iron/Buhl - #712

K	1	2	3	R
21	24	17	23	--
21	25	18	24	
22	26	19	24	
24	26	20	25	

Mountain Lake - #173

K	1	2	3	R
22	19	22	14	
24	19	23	14	

Nashwauk/Keewatin - #319

K	1	2	3	R
20	18	24	24	--
24	19	24	24	
25	22	24		
25				

Nevis - #308

K	1	2	3	R
14	24	20	17	--

New London/Spicer - #345

K	1	2	3	R
22	26	26	26	--
22	26	26	26	
22	27	28	27	
23	27	36	28	
23	28			
24				

New Prague - #721

K	1	2	3	R
23	22	26	24	--
23	23	26	24	
24	23	26	25	
25	24	27	25	
25				
25				
25				

New Richland - #827

K	1	2	3	R
29	23	26	20	22
30	24	27		

New Ulm - # 88

K	1	2	3	R
16	22	21	24	15*
16	23	22	25	25*
17	24	22	25	25*
19	25	22	26	
22	25	22	26	
22	25	25	27	
22	25			
22				
23				

New York Mills - #553

K	1	2	3	R
20	17	19	16	4
21	18	20	28	19
22	18	29	28	19
				20
				36*

Newfolden - #441

K	1	2	3	R
18	20	16	15	--
21	20	25	17	

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Nicollet - #507

K	1	2	3	R
24	13 30	31	18	--

North Branch - # 138

K	1	2	3	R
21 (1)	22 (3)	22 (1)	24 (1)	22* (1)
22 (1)	23 (1)	23 (1)	25 (2)	23* (1)
23 (3)	24 (4)	24 (1)	26 (1)	24* (2)
24 (1)		25 (1)	27 (1)	25* (1)
		26 (2)		

North St.Paul/Maplewood - #622

K	1	2	3	R
18 (2)	8 (1) & 10 (1)	23 (2)	22	
19 (2)	14 (1) & 11 (1)	24 (3)		
20 (4)	16 (1) 13 (1)	25 (4)		
21 (1)	21 (1) 23 (2)	26 (2)		
22 (1)	22 (2) 24 (1)	27 (3)		
23 (5)	23 (5) 25 (3)	28 (3)		
24 (5)	24 (5) 26 (3)	29 (2)		
25 (4)	25 (4) 28 (3)	30 (1)		
26 (1)	26 (2) 29 (3)			
27 (3)	27 (1) 30 (3)			
28 (2)	28 (1)			
	29 (2)			

Northfield - #659

K	1	2	3	R
20	18	23	22	14*
21	24	24	23	14*
21	25	24	23	14*
21	25	25	23	14*
22	25	25	23	14*
22	25	25	23	14*
22	25	25		14*
22	26	25		14*
23	26			
23	26			
23	27			
24				

Norwood - #108

K	1	2	3	R
17	12	20	24	
18	21	21	25	
20	21	21	25	
20				

Ogilvie - #333

K	1	2	3	R
27	30	28	23	55*
27	30	29	23	
		30		

Oklee - #627

K	1	2	3	R
19	19	24	18	
20	19		18	

Olivia - #653

K	1	2	3	R
23	14	22	19	
23	14	23	19	
24				

Onamia - #480

K	1	2	3	R
20	22	19	23	
20	23	20	24	
20	24	21	24	
21				

Orono - #278

K	1	2	3	R
21	21	25	26	23
22	23	25	27	
24	23	25	27	
28	23	26	28	
28				

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Ortonville - #62

K	1	2	3	R
24	20	19	23	19#
40		20	23	
		20		
		21		

Osakis - #213

K	1	2	3	R
21	20	21	14	
23	21			

Oslo - #442

K	1	2	3	R
--	23	13	16	

Osseo - #279

K		1		2		3		R
12	(2)	9	(1) &	11	(1) &	9	(1)	
21	(7)	21	(2)	19	(1)	18	(2)	
22	(8)	22	(12)	20	(1)	19	(1)	
23	(9)	23	(11)	21	(3)	20	(2)	
24	(4)	24	(15)	23	(4)	21	(4)	
25	(2)	25	(9)	24	(5)	22	(4)	
26	(3)	26	(8)	25	(12)	23	(2)	
27	(11)	27	(1)	26	(11)	24	(8)	
28	(5)			27	(9)	25	(10)	
29	(5)			28	(5)	26	(4)	
30	(2)			29	(2)	27	(3)	
31	(2)			30	(1)	28	(5)	
32	(1)			31	(1)	29	(6)	
						30	(3)	

Owatonna - #761

K		1		2		3		R
21	(1)	22	(2)	21	(1)	22	(2)	24 (1)
22	(1)	24	(1)	22	(3)	23	(1)	
23	(1)	25	(4)	23	(4)	24	(3)	
24	(3)	26	(5)	24	(3)	25	(3)	
25	(6)			25	(2)	26	(2)	
26	(1)							
27	(1)							

Park Rapids - #309

K	1	2	3	R
19	13	24	27	
	24	25		
	24	26		
	24	26		
	25	26		
	25	27		
		27		

Parkers Prairie - #547

K	1	2	3	R
24	24	27	15	
24	25	28	16	

Paynesville - #741

K	1	2	3	R
20	22	25	24	25
21	22	25	24	
21	22	25	24	
22	26		24	
22				

Pelican Rapids - #548

K	1	2	3	R
22	21	23	23	
23	21	23	23	
23	21	23	24	
23	22	23		

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Pequot Lakes - #186

K	1	2	3	R
19	25	23	21	
20	26	25	21	
20	26	25	21	

Perham - #549

K	1	2	3	R
18	15	17	23	
22	21	20	23	
23	23	20	24	
23	24	20	25	
24	24			

Peterson - #232

K	1	2	3	R
15	16	13	15	

Pierz - #484

K	1	2	3	R
25	29	20	21	
26				
28				

Pillager - #16

K	1	2	3	R
24	25	27	29	18*
24				30*
24				

Pine City - #578

K	1	2	3	R
23	20	22	27	
24	20	22	28	
24	21	24	28	
24	22	24	28	
24	22	25		
24	22			

Pine Island - #255

K	1	2	3	R
19	20	18	17	
20	20	18	18	
21	20	18	18	
21	20	18	19	

Pine Point - #25

K	1	2	3	R
--	--	--	--	19*

Pine River - #117

K	1	2	3	R
15	11	23	24	
15	24	23	24	
15	25	25	25	
15	25			

Pipestone - #583

K	1	2	3	R
21	21	25	22	
23	21	25	22	
25	21	25	23	
27	21	26	24	

Plainview - #810

K	1	2	3	R
17	18	17	25	
17	18	19	25	
19	19	19	25	
20	20	20		

Plummer - #628

K	1	2	3	R
11	17	18	13	
12			13	

Preston - #233

K	1	2	3	R
44	19	30	21	
	21		22	

Princeton - #477

K	1	2	3	R
20	21	22	22	21*
23	22	23	25	22*
23	23	24	26	35*
24	23	24	26	
24	23	24	26	
24	23	25	27	
24	24	25	27	
24	25	25	28	
25	27			

Prior Lake - #719

K	1	2	3	R
23	26	24	25	
24	21	26	25	
24	21	26	25	
24	22	26	26	
24	22	26	26	
24	23	27	26	
24	24	27		
24	26	28		
24	30			

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Proctor - #704

K	1	2	3	R
14	19	20	17	17*
15	25	21	22	
16	26	23	23	
18	26	23	24	
19	26	24	24	
19	26	29	29	
20				
24				

Randolph - #195

K	1	2	3	R
16	16	25	15	
18	17			

Raymond - #346

K	1	2	3	R
39	30	22	27	30*

Red Lake - #38

K	1	2	3	R
14	17	15	--	15
16	22	25		
23	23			
24	28			

Red Lake Falls - #630

K	1	2	3	R
20	14	24	21	
20	14			
21				

Red Wing - #256

K		1		2		3		R
22	(2)	22	(1)	21	(3)	18	(2)	
23	(5)	23	(2)	22	(4)	22	(1)	
24	(1)	24	(1)	23	(1)	23	(1)	
26	(2)	25	(5)	24	(1)	24	(3)	
						27	(1)	
						28	(1)	

Redwood Falls - #637

K	1	2	3	R
28	20	24	21	26
28	20	25	22	
29	20		22	
29	21		23	
			26	
			27	

Remer - #118

K	1	2	3	R
28	20	22	21	
28	20	25	22	
29	20	26	22	
29	21		23	
			26	
			27	

Richfield - #280

K		1		2		3		R
18	(1)	23	(5)	22	(1)	23	(1)	
21	(1)	24	(5)	23	(6)	24	(3)	
25	(2)	25	(2)	24	(7)	25	(1)	
26	(3)			25	(1)	26	(2)	
27	(2)					27	(2)	
28	(3)					28	(1)	
29	(1)							

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Robbinsdale - #281

K		1		2		3		R	
18	(5)	13	(1)	8	(1)	8	(1)	8	(1)*
19	(1)	21	(1)	13	(1)	13	(1)	11	(1)*
20	(3)	22	(1)	15	(1)	15	92)	13	(1)*
21	(5)	23	(5)	16	(1)	16	(1)	14	(1)*
22	(4)	24	(6)	17	(1)	17	(1)	26	(2)
23	(4)	25	(11)	22	(1)	22	(5)	27	(1)*
24	(3)	26	(2)	23	(4)	23	(2)	28	(3)*
25	(4)	27	(5)	24	(1)	24	(2)	29	(2)*
26	(4)	28	(4)	25	(6)	25	(2)	30	(1)*
27	(6)	29	(3)	26	(5)	26	(4)		
28	(4)	30	(1)	27	(4)	27	(5)		
29	(3)	31	(1)	28	(3)	28	(2)		
34	(1)			30	(3)	29	(2)		
177	(1)			31	(1)	30	(1)		
				32	(1)	31	(2)		

Rochester - 535

K		1		2		3		R
17	(1)	7	(1)	5	(2)	9	(1)	
18	(3)	8	(1)	9	(1)	10	(1)	
19	(3)	10	(3)	10	(1)	11	(1)	
20	(2)	12	(1)	11	(2)	12	(1)	
21	(4)	13	(1)	13	(4)	13	(1)	
22	(6)	15	(1)	15	(2)	14	(5)	
23	(7)	17	(4)	19	(3)	15	(1)	
24	(5)	19	(1)	20	(1)	17	(1)	
26	(8)	20	(4)	21	(1)	18	(2)	
27	(2)	21	(7)	22	(1)	21	(3)	
28	(2)	23	(2)	23	(1)	24	(1)	
29	(1)	24	(5)	24	(5)	25	(3)	
		25	(4)	25	(2)	26	(3)	
		26	(2)	27	(5)	27	(2)	
		27	(1)	28	(2)	28	(1)	
		28	(1)	29	(1)	29	(6)	
		29	(4)	30	(2)	30	(1)	
		30	(1)	31	(1)	31	(1)	
		31	(1)			32	(1)	

Rockford - #883

K	1	2	3	R
24	20	21	22	
24	20	21	22	
24	21	21	22	
25	21	22		
25		22		

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Rosseau - #682

K	1	2	3	R
13	24	22	19	
21	26	23	20	
22	26	24	20	
23			21	
23				

Rosemount - #196

K		1		2		3		R	
20	(8)	19	(1)	21	(1)	20	(1)	21	(1)*
21	(3)	20	(3)	22	(8)	21	(3)	22	(1)*
22	(3)	21	(6)	23	(6)	22	(2)	24	(1)*
23	(7)	22	(3)	24	(15)	23	(7)	25	(4)*
24	(13)	23	(6)	25	(7)	24	(3)		
25	(10)	24	(7)	26	(7)	25	(3)		
26	(6)	25	(9)	27	(1)	26	(11)		
27	(1)	26	(8)	28	(1)	27	(11)		
28	(1)	27	(3)		-	28	(2)		
29	(1)	28	(1)						
50	(1)								
51	(1)								
53	(1)								

Roseville - #623

K		1		2		3		R
18	(2)	12	(1)	12	(1)	11	(2)	
20	(1)	21	(1)	13	(1)	14	(1)	
21	91)	22	(2)	23	(3)	17	(1)	
22	(1)	23	(7)	24	(1)	24	(7)	
23	(1)	24	(3)	25	(5)	25	(2)	
24	(2)	25	(5)	26	(3)	27	(1)	
25	(4)	26	(1)	27	(4)	29	(1)	
26	(1)	27	(1)	28	(1)	33	(1)	
27	(2)							
28	(1)							
29	(2)							
30	(3)							

Rothsay - #850

K	1	2	3	R
15	18	18	21	

Royalton - #485

K	1	2	3	R
15	19	22	20	
20	19	23	22	
21		23	22	
			23	

Rush City - #139

K	1	2	3	R
26	18	23	22	
26	18	24	22	
	18	25	23	

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Rushford - #234

K	1	2	3	R
18	22	22	25	
19	24	23	27	
19				

Russell - #418

K	1	2	3	R
12	22	20	15	
13				

Ruthton - #584

K	1	2	3	R
15	11	17	14	

Sacred Heart - #655

K	1	2	3	R
17	16	25	23	
18	16		23	
35	17			

St. Anthony/New Brighton - #282

K	1	2	3	R
26	23	21	23	15
27	23	25	23	
27	24	25		

St. Charles - #858

K	1	2	3	R
21	24	23	22	
21	25	24	22	
21	26	24	23	
21				

St. Clair - #75

K	1	2	3	R
19	24	17	21	
22	24	18		

St. Cloud - #742

K		1		2		3		R
21	(6)	21	(3)	20	(2)	21	(1)	
22	(2)	22	(3)	21	(2)	22	(1)	
23	(2)	23	(1)	22	(1)	23	(1)	
24	(2)	24	(16)	23	(7)	24	(8)	
25	(17)	25	(14)	24	(2)	25	(17)	
27	(5)	26	(1)	25	(16)	26	(3)	
28	(2)	27	(3)	26	(4)	27	(2)	
29	(7)	28	(1)	27	(3)	28	(2)	
		29	(1)			29	(2)	

St. Francis - #15

K		1		2		3		R
25	(4)	24	(3)	24	(1)	24	(3)	
26	(4)	25	(1)	25	(2)	25	(5)	
27	(3)	26	(4)	26	(2)	26	(2)	
28	(1)	27	(2)	27	(4)	27	(1)	
29	(1)	28	(3)	28	(1)			

St. James - #840

K	1	2	3	R
17	24	22	18	
24	25	22	20	
24	25	22	20	
24	25	23	20	
25	25		21	
	25			

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

St. Louis County - #710

K	1	2	3	R
19 (2)	11 (1)	16 (1)	15 (1)	
21 (1)	15 (2)	17 (2)	16 (1)	
23 (2)	16 (1)	19 (3)	17 (2)	
24 (1)	17 (1)	20 (3)	18 (1)	
25 (3)	18 (1)	22 (1)	19 (1)	
27 (1)	19 (1)	24 (1)	20 (1)	
	20 (1)		25 (1)	
	21 (1)		26 (1)	

St. Louis Park - #283

K	1	2	3	R
21 (1)	24 (5)	24 (1)	22 (1)	22 (1)*
22 (1)	25 (4)	25 (1)	23 (3)	36 (2)*
24 (3)	26 (2)	26 (1)	24 (1)	84 (1)*
25 (1)	27 (2)	27 (2)	26 (4)	93 (1)*
27 (1)		28 (2)	27 (1)	
28 (2)		29 (3)		
29 (2)				
30 (1)				

St. Michael/Albertville - #885

K	1	2	3	R
20	20	20	25	
23	20	26	25	
24	20	27	26	
	26		27	

St. Paul - #625

K	1	2	3	R
10 (2)	9 (1)	5 (1) &	12 (1)	8
12 (3)	16 (2)	6 (1)	13 (1)	10
13 (2)	17 (1)	7 (1)	14 (1)	11
14 (1)	19 (4)	10 (1)	15 (1)	19*
15 (1)	20 (2)	11 (1)	16 (2)	21*
16 (1)	21 (6)	12 (2)	18 (3)	23* (2)
17 (2)	22 (3)	21 (1)	20 (1)	24*
18 (3)	23 (5)	22 (2)	21 (1)	27* (3)
19 (3)	24 (10)	23 (7)	22 (2)	28* (4)
20 (7)	25 (11)	24 (9)	23 (1)	30* (2)
21 (10)	26 (9)	25 (6)	24 (6)	36*
22 (16)	27 (14)	26 (10)	25 (8)	47
23 (16)	28 (17)	27 (13)	26 (6)	51*
24 (12)	29 (2)	28 (7)	27 (10)	65
25 (22)	30 (4)	29 (3)	28 (6)	
26 (11)	31 (1)	30 (4)	29 (3)	
27 (3)	42 (1)	32 (4)	30 (7)	
28 (4)	625 (1)	33 (1)	31 (7)	
46 (1)		47 (1)	32 (2)	
123 (1)		77 (1)	35 (1)	
			36 (1)	

St. Peter - #508

K	1	2	3	R
19	21	23	20	
20	21	23	20	
20	22	24	21	
20	22	25	23	
21	23	25	23	
21	23	26	24	
22				

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Sandborn - #638

K	1	2	3	R
14	14	22	12	

Sandstone - #576

K	1	2	3	R
22	27	25	21	5*
23	28	25	21	15

Sartell - #748

K	1	2	3	R
20	21	22	16	
23	22	23	22	
23	24	24	22	
23	24		23	
24	26		23	
24			24	
			24	

Sauk Centre - #743

K	1	2	3	R
22	22	24	20	
24	22	24	21	
		24		

Sauk Rapids - #47

K	1	2	3	R
18	17	18	22	
19	21	20	23	
19	22	21	25	
21	22	21	25	
21	22	23	26	
22	22	23	26	
22	23	23	27	
23	25	24	27	
25	25			
26				
26				

Sebeka - #820

K	1	2	3	R
19	18	26	20	
20	20	27	21	
20			21	
			21	

Shakopee - #720

K	1	2	3	R
20	22	22	25	
20	23	24	25	
22	23	26	25	
23	24	26	26	
23	25	27	26	
25		27	27	
25		27	28	
26				
26				
26				
26				

Sherburn - #456

K	1	2	3	R
20	18	14	18	
21	18	15		

Silver Lake - #425

K	1	2	3	R
17	20	16	22	
23				

Sioux Valley - #328

K	1	2	3	R
16	19	19	28	

Slayton - #504

K	1	2	3	R
16	16	21	18	
17	17	21	18	
19	21	22	20	
20			20	

Sleepy Eye - #84

K	1	2	3	R
16	24	19	10	
31	24	20	20	

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

South Koochiching - #363

K	1	2	3	R
18	15	12	18	

South St. Paul - #S-6

K	1	2	3	R
24	20	14	08	
25	20	27	21	
29	20	28	22	
29	21	28	22	
29	23	28	22	
29	24	28	26	
	25	28	26	
	25	29	26	
	25			

South Washington County - #833

K	1	2	3	R
21 (1)	23 (1)	23 (3)	24 (4)	26 (1)
23 (2)	24 (9)	24 (3)	25 (5)	
24 (8)	25 (6)	25 (3)	26 (8)	
25 (15)	26 (11)	26 (9)	27 (4)	
26 (4)	28 (3)	28 (4)	28 (5)	
27 (1)	30 (1)	29 (1)	29 (1)	
	37 (1)	37 (1)		

Southland - #500

K	1	2	3	R
15	19	18	22	15
15	20	18	22	
15		18		

Spring Grove - #297

K	1	2	3	R
20	22	18	25	
22	22	19		

Spring Lake Park - #16

K	1	2	3	R
8 (2)	19 (2)	24 (5)	22 (1)	19 (1)*
19 (1)	20 (2)	25 (1)	23 (3)	23 (1)*
21 (2)	21 (2)	26 (5)	24 (4)	
23 (2)	23 (1)	27 (1)	25 (3)	
24 (2)	24 (2)		26 (1)	
25 (1)	26 (1)			
26 (3)	27 (2)			
28 (1)	28 (1)			
29 (1)				

Spring Valley - #237

K	1	2	3	R
18	16	16	16	
18	16	17	18	
18	17	17	18	
19				

Springfield - #85

K	1	2	3	R
18	24	19	10	
21	24	20	20	
23				

Staples - #793

K	1	2	3	R
14	27	29	18	7
15	28	30	25	8
29	28	89	26	8
40	83			10
47				
48				

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Starbuck - #614

K	1	2	3	R
22	13	21	16	
23	14	22	16	

Stephen - #443

K	1	2	3	R
23	22	25	25	
23				

Stewart - #426

K	1	2	3	R
27	25	21	22	

Stewartville - #534

K	1	2	3	R
21	23	19	23	
22	23	21	24	
22	24	21	25	
23	25	23	25	
24	25	24	25	
25		25		

Stillwater - #834

K		1		2		3		R	
24	(1)	23	(1)	12	(1)	22	(1)	27	(1)*
25	(1)	24	93)	17	(1)	24	92)	29	(4)*
26	(3)	25	(3)	23	(3)	26	(1)	30	(1)*
27	(3)	26	(1)	24	(2)	27	(1)	31	(4)*
28	(1)	27	(5)	25	(5)	29	(3)	32	(2)*
29	(3)	28	(2)	26	(1)	30	(3)	33	(2)*
30	(2)			30	(3)				

Storden/Jeffers - #178

K	1	2	3	R
15	20	14	16	
16	30	14	16	

Strandquist - #444

K	1	2	3	R
9	11	7	14	

Swanville - #486

K	1	2	3	R
17	15	25	28	
18	16			

Taylors Falls - #140

K	1	2	3	R
17	27	27	29	

Thief River Falls - #564

K	1	2	3	R
26	26	21	23	
27	27	21	24	
27	27	24	25	
27	27	25	26	
30	27	26	27	
	28	26	27	
	29	29		

Tower-Soudan - #708

K	1	2	3	R
--	15	31	25	
	25		25	

Tracy - #417

K	1	2	3	R
18	19	19	27	
18	19	19	27	
19	20			

Trimont - #457

K	1	2	3	R
27	16	16	30	

Truman - #458

K	1	2	3	R
21	14	20	23	
21	14	20		
29				

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Twin Valley - #526

K	1	2	3	R
14	14	26	15	
15	16		15	

Tyler - #409

K	1	2	3	R
17	16	21	21	
19	17	21	23	
			23	

Ulen-Hitterdal - #914

K	1	2	3	R
15	17	21	15	
16	18	21	15	

Underwood - #550

K	1	2	3	R
16	15	10	11	
17	20	20		
		26		

Upsala - #487

K	1	2	3	R
18	17	--	27	24*
18	17			25*
	18			

Verdi - #408

K	1	2	3	R
6	5	10	1	

Verndale - #818

K	1	2	3	R
20	16	22	--	
21	21			

Villard - #615

K	1	2	3	R
18	--	15	17	

Virginia - #706

K	1	2	3	R
24	25	24	24	25
25	25	25	24	
25	25	26	24	
25	25	26	25	
25	26	27	25	
25	26		25	
26	26			

Wabasha - #811

K	1	2	3	R
22	26	25	24	
	27	26	25	

Wabasso - #640

K	1	2	3	R
20	24	20	--	22*
21				

Waconia - #110

K	1	2	3	R
23	--	--	--	
23				
25				
25				

Wadena - #819

K	1	2	3	R
21	21	19	22	
22	21	21	22	
22	22	22	23	
22	22	22	23	
23			23	

Waldorf/Pemberton - #913

K	1	2	3	R
23	19	14	29	
23	21	17		

Walker - #119

K	1	2	3	R
41	17	17	27	
	17	22	27	
	18	23		
	21			

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Walnut Grove - #641

K	1	2	3	R
16	16	23	24	
16				

Wanamingo - #258

K	1	2	3	R
13	26	24	23	
14				

Warren - #446

K	1	2	3	R
14	22	18	22	
14	22	20	22	
25	22	20		

Warroad - #690

K	1	2	3	R
21	21	20	24	
21	24	20	24	
22	26	21		
25		22		

Waseca - #829

K	1	2	3	R
22	20	21	22	
22	23	21	22	
22	23	21	23	
22	24	21	23	
23	24	21		
23		25		
23				
24				
25				

Watertown/Mayer - #111

K	1	2	3	R
24	21	21	21	
25	21	22	21	
25	23	22	21	
26	23	22	22	
	23			

Waterville - #395

K	1	2	3	R
24	21	23	20	
24	21	23	22	
26		23	22	

Waubun - #435

K	1	2	3	R
16	14	14	15	15
18	21	17	17	
24		18	19	
		21		

Wayzata - #284

K	1	2	3	R
23 (3)	9 (1)	10 (1)	6 (1)	25 (1)
24 (1)	22 (1)	14 (1)	11 (1)	
25 (5)	23 (5)	17 (1)	12 (1)	
26 (1)	24 (3)	19 (1)	15 (1)	
27 (3)	25 (3)	22 (1)	22 (1)	
28 (1)	26 (2)	23 (1)	23 (1)	
29 (1)	27 (4)	24 (2)	24 (2)	
	28 (1)	25 (1)	25 (1)	
		26 (4)	27 (3)	
		27 (2)	28 (5)	
		28 (4)	30 (2)	
		30 (1)		

Welcome - #459

K	1	2	3	R
--	--	23	16	18*
			28	

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Wells - #224

K	1	2	3	R
17	21	18	24	20
17	22	19	24	
17				
18				

West Concord - #205

K	1	2	3	R
20	22	19	23	
21		20		

West St. Paul - 197

K	1	2	3	R
20 (4)	20 (3)	20 (2)	22 (2)	12 (1)
21 (2)	21 (1)	21 (4)	25 (2)	
23 (3)	24 (3)	22 (2)	26 (1)	
24 (4)	26 (4)	23 (1)	27 (2)	
	27 (1)	25 (3)	28 (2)	
	28 (1)			

Westbrook - #175

K	1	2	3	R
14	15	22	24	
15	16			

Westonka - #277

K	1	2	3	R
22	13	22	27	
22	22	26	27	
23	23	27	28	
25	23	27	28	
26	25	27	28	
26	26	27	28	
28	26	27		
29	26			
	26			

Wheaton - #803

K	1	2	3	R
22	22	22	18	
22	22	23	18	

White Bear Lake - #624

K	1	2	3	R
17 (2)	20 (2)	15 (1) &	10 (1)	25 (2)*
18 (1)	21 (3)	24 (1)	12 (1)	26 (2)*
19 (1)	22 (1)	25 (1)	21 (1)	27 (4)*
20 (3)	23 (3)	27 (6)	23 (2)	
22 (2)	25 (1)	28 (4)	24 (6)	
25 (2)	26 (1)	29 (2)	25 (2)	
26 (7)	27 (2)		26 (2)	
27 (3)	28 (2)		28 (3)	
28 (3)	29 (3)			
52 (1)	30 (1)			

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Willmar - #347

K	1	2	3	R
19 (1)	20 (1)	22 (2)	22 (1)	10 (1)*
21 (2)	21 (2)	23 (1)	24 (4)	16 (1)*
22 (1)	23 (1)	24 (1)	25 (3)	19 (1)*
23 (2)	24 (4)	26 (1)	26 (1)	20 (1)*
24 (1)	25 (4)	27 (2)	27 (1)	180 (1)*
25 (1)	26 (1)	28 (2)	29 (1)	
26 (1)		29 (2)		
27 (3)				
28 (1)				

Willow River - #577

K	1	2	3	R
11	22	--	27	23*
12				23*
23				
23				

Windom - #177

K	1	2	3	R
20	23	23	23	7
21	23	24	24	7

Winnebago - #225

K	1	2	3	R
19	16	--	25	24*
20	16			25*

Winona - #861

K	1	2	3	R
18 (2)	12 (2) &	11 (1)	14 (1)	
19 (1)	23 (1) &	15 (1) &	16 (1)	
20 (1)	24 (1)	16 (1)	18 (1)	
21 (3)	25 (2)	21 (1)	20 (2)	
22 (1)	26 (2)	22 (2)	21 (1)	
24 (2)	27 (4)	23 (2)	22 (1)	
25 (3)	28 (2)	25 (1)	23 (2)	
27 (1)		26 (1)	28 (5)	
28 (1)		27 (2)		
38 (2)		28 (2)		

Winsted - #427

K	1	2	3	R
14	--	--	--	27*
15				

Winthrop - #735

K	1	2	3	R
20	19	10 & 12		18*
20		23	26	

Worthington - #518

K	1	2	3	R
21	22	24	25	
22	22	24	25	
22	23	24	25	
22	23	25	26	
22	23	25	26	
23	23	25	26	
23	24	26		
23				
24				

Wrenshall - #100

K	1	2	3	R
15	20	10 & 9		
15		21	24	

Kindergarten Through Grade Three Class Size - 1985-86
Minnesota Public School Districts

Wykoff - #236					Zumbrota - #260				
K	1	2	3	R	K	1	2	3	R
25	24	18	26		43	26	25	20	16
					45	27	27	22	

APPENDIX C

Comparison of Projected 1987-88 Revenues for Minnesota School Districts Based on Current Pupil Unit Weightings and a Potential Weighting of 1.2 Pupil Units for Grades 1-12 and .6 Pupil Unit for Kindergarten

Case Number	District Number	District Name			87-88 Revenue By Current Weightings	87-88 Revenue By Potential Weightings	Change in Revenue
1	11.	AITKI	N		3397442.	3405969.	8527.
2	13.	MINNE	APOLI	S	123331820.	125901346.	2569527.
3	21.	HILL	CITY		1061136.	1058422.	-2714.
4	41.	NC GR	EGOR		1786100.	1812155.	26055.
5	63.	SOUTH	ST.	PAUL	8295545.	8350096.	54550.
6	111.	ANOKA			79711589.	80206336.	494746.
7	121.	CENTE	NNIAL		9105333.	9333842.	228509.
8	131.	COLUM	BIA H	EIGHT	10026900.	9986635.	-40264.
9	141.	FRIDL	EY		7083091.	7070402.	-12689.
10	151.	ST. F	RANCI	S	10344360.	10463266.	118906.
11	161.	SPRIN	G LAK	E PAR	10289509.	10436540.	147031.
12	211.	AUDUB	ON		918242.	913593.	-4649.
13	221.	DETRO	IT LA	KES	7280000.	7240918.	-39082.
14	231.	FRAZE	E-VER	GAS	3210454.	3274418.	63965.
15	241.	LAKE	PARK		1141789.	1157091.	15302.
16	311.	BEMID	JI		12921578.	13076616.	155039.
17	321.	BLACK	DUCK		1981470.	1997023.	15553.
18	361.	KELLI	HER		774302.	781946.	7644.
19	381.	REDLA	KE		3379426.	3488333.	108907.
20	471.	SAUK	RAPID	S	5844164.	5969600.	125436.
21	511.	FOLEY			4004820.	3994558.	-10262.
22	571.	BEARD	SLEY		305243.	309822.	4579.
23	581.	CLINT	ON		469788.	473774.	3986.
24	601.	GRACE	VILLE		723658.	726137.	2478.
25	621.	ORTON	VILLE		1795811.	1792926.	-2886.
26	701.	LAKE	CRYST	AL	1732900.	1796460.	63560.
27	721.	MAPLE	TON		1420018.	1443244.	23226.
28	751.	ST. C	LAIR		1097719.	1128419.	30700.
29	771.	MANKA	TO		16826704.	17146092.	319388.
30	781.	GARDE	N CIT	Y	1336912.	1351402.	14490.
31	791.	AMBOY	-GOOD	THUND	871106.	897765.	26660.
32	811.	COMFR	EY		604024.	605164.	1141.
33	841.	SLEEP	Y EYE		1505079.	1514544.	9466.
34	851.	SPRIN	GFIEL	D	1337100.	1324266.	-12834.
35	881.	NEW U	LM		6743948.	6718608.	-25341.
36	911.	BARNU	M		1829908.	1849035.	19127.
37	931.	CARLT	ON		2098475.	2117102.	18627.
38	941.	CLOQU	ET		6204613.	6195111.	-9502.
39	951.	CROMW	ELL		977039.	978563.	1523.
40	971.	MOOSE	LAKE		1945991.	1969641.	23650.
41	991.	ESKO			2464333.	2472855.	8522.
42	1001.	WRENS	HALL		969159.	969216.	57.
43	1081.	MORAO	OD-YO	UNG A	2362418.	2353344.	-9074.
44	1101.	MACON	IA		3089410.	3048183.	-41227.
45	1111.	WATER	TOWN-	MAYER	2774713.	2820725.	46012.
46	1121.	CHASK	A		8186482.	8150904.	-35577.
47	1141.	BACKU	S		933804.	950724.	16920.
48	1151.	CASS	LAKE		2448065.	2475716.	27651.
49	1161.	PILLA	GER		1215675.	1219391.	3716.
50	1171.	PINE	RIVER		2183083.	2215793.	32710.

Comparison of Projected 1987-88 Revenues for Minnesota School Districts Based on Current Pupil Unit Weightings and a Potential Weighting of 1.2 Pupil Units for Grades 1-12 and .6 Pupil Unit for Kindergarten

Case Number	District Number	District Name			87-88 Revenue By Current Weightings	87-88 Revenue By Potential Weightings	Change in Revenue
51	1181.	REMER			1868521.	1866694.	-1827.
52	1191.	WALKE	R-HAC	KENSA	2018450.	2022313.	3863.
53	1261.	CLARA	CITY		905457.	923104.	17648.
54	1271.	WAYNA	RD		565875.	574921.	9046.
55	1281.	MILAN			618623.	630722.	12098.
56	1291.	MONTE	VIDEO		4230280.	4306157.	75877.
57	1381.	NORTH	BRAN	CH	6110414.	6167992.	57578.
58	1391.	RUSH	CITY		2035462.	2046397.	10936.
59	1401.	TAYLO	RS FA	LLS	803543.	815680.	12137.
60	1411.	CHISA	GO LA	KES	5529046.	5617980.	88935.
61	1451.	GLYND	ON-FE	LTON	1510912.	1518316.	7404.
62	1461.	BARNE	SVILL	E	2252759.	2278616.	25857.
63	1471.	BILWO	RTH		1418488.	1439497.	21009.
64	1501.	HAWLE	Y		2029549.	2034727.	5178.
65	1521.	MOORH	EAD		12760651.	12949281.	188629.
66	1581.	GONVI	CK-TR	AIL	580972.	572433.	-8539.
67	1611.	CLEAR	BROOK		956303.	954987.	-1316.
68	1621.	BAGLE	Y		3747145.	3812148.	65003.
69	1661.	COOK	COUNT	Y	1646892.	1663595.	16703.
70	1731.	MOUNT	AIN L	AKE	1304968.	1295498.	-9469.
71	1751.	WESTB	ROOK		803206.	802736.	-470.
72	1771.	WINDO	M		3356040.	3360139.	4099.
73	1781.	STORD	EN-JE	FFERS	850626.	860110.	9485.
74	1811.	BRAIN	ERD		15943524.	16119510.	175986.
75	1821.	CROSB	Y-IRO	NTON	4145651.	4203027.	57376.
76	1861.	PEQUO	T LAK	ES	2339539.	2340212.	673.
77	1911.	BURNS	VILLE		23392651.	23495827.	103175.
78	1921.	FARMI	NGTON		5592721.	5742215.	149494.
79	1941.	LAKEV	ILLE		8692683.	8749164.	56481.
80	1951.	RANDO	LPH		871210.	865365.	-5845.
81	1961.	ROSEM	OUNT		38469883.	39086350.	616467.
82	1971.	WEST	ST. P	AUL	11061460.	11087900.	26440.
83	1991.	INVER	GROV	E-PIN	9081300.	9153311.	72011.
84	2001.	HASTI	NGS		11455802.	11480079.	24277.
85	2011.	CLARE	MONT		533008.	542028.	9020.
86	2021.	DODGE	CENT	ER	1528052.	1562288.	34237.
87	2031.	HAYFI	ELD		2431837.	2488831.	56994.
88	2041.	KASSO	N-HAN	TORVI	3228546.	3304819.	76272.
89	2051.	WEST	CONCO	RD	1070098.	1055748.	-14349.
90	2061.	ALEXA	NDRIA		9443314.	9477789.	34474.
91	2071.	BRAND	ON		1047288.	1048137.	849.
92	2081.	EVANS	VILLE		682363.	707120.	24758.
93	2091.	KENSI	NGTON		471179.	481561.	10382.
94	2131.	OSAKI	S		1552884.	1514237.	-38647.
95	2171.	BRICE	LYN		429244.	426731.	-2513.
96	2181.	BELAV	AN		376826.	385066.	8240.
97	2191.	ELMOR	E		579809.	582314.	2505.
98	2221.	KIEST	ER-HA	LTERS	574436.	577654.	3218.
99	2231.	MINNE	SOTA	LAKE	670242.	686362.	16120.
100	2241.	WELLS			1853903.	1873561.	19658.

Comparison of Projected 1987-88 Revenues for Minnesota School Districts Based on Current Pupil Unit Weightings and a Potential Weighting of 1.2 Pupil Units for Grades 1-12 and .6 Pupil Unit for Kindergarten

Case Number	District Number	District Name		87-88 Revenue By Current Weightings	87-88 Revenue By Potential Weightings	Change in Revenue
101	2251.	WINNE	BAGO	1046826.	1066366.	19540.
102	2271.	CHATF	IELD	2209683.	2208677.	-1006.
103	2281.	MARMO	NY	1058419.	1050840.	-7579.
104	2291.	LAKES	BORO	1012912.	1020565.	7653.
105	2321.	PETER	SON	518885.	511569.	-7315.
106	2331.	PREST	ON-FO	UNTAI	1348738.	1361886.	13148.
107	2341.	RUSHF	ORD	1560243.	1587217.	26974.
108	2361.	WYKOF	F	642941.	652636.	9695.
109	2371.	SPRIN	G VAL	LEY	2032403.	2024978.	-7425.
110	2381.	MABEL	-CANT	ON	1093092.	1093017.	-75.
111	2401.	BLUE	EARTH		2626779.	2642124.	15344.
112	2411.	ALBER	T LEA		12119746.	12191574.	71828.
113	2421.	ALDEN			913910.	914856.	947.
114	2431.	EMMON	S		475219.	484442.	9223.
115	2441.	FREEB	ORN		481522.	481326.	-196.
116	2451.	GLENV	ILLE		1071448.	1076834.	5385.
117	2521.	CAMBO	N FAL	LS	3522568.	3580183.	57615.
118	2531.	GOODH	UE		1322176.	1341045.	18869.
119	2541.	KENYO	N		1556448.	1566224.	9776.
120	2551.	PINE	ISLAN	D	2560489.	2598163.	37673.
121	2561.	RED W	ING		7627989.	7579918.	-48071.
122	2581.	WANAM	INGO		772964.	778724.	5759.
123	2601.	ZUMBR	OTA		1800498.	1822750.	22252.
124	2611.	ASHBY			753379.	765749.	12370.
125	2621.	BARRE	TT		339310.	336076.	-3233.
126	2631.	ELBOW	LAKE		1186018.	1206252.	20234.
127	2641.	HERMA	N		806983.	822532.	15550.
128	2651.	HOFFM	AN		617943.	636121.	18178.
129	2701.	HOPKI	NS		19309985.	19324452.	14468.
130	2711.	BLOOM	INGTO	N	33308362.	33037397.	-270965.
131	2721.	EDEN	PRAIR	IE	12543602.	12891486.	347885.
132	2731.	EDINA			15426433.	14986612.	-439822.
133	2761.	MINNE	TONKA		14766068.	14696866.	-69202.
134	2771.	WESTO	NKA		7032824.	7013547.	-19277.
135	2781.	ORONO			5491893.	5518931.	27037.
136	2791.	OSSEO			45835203.	46727187.	871983.
137	2801.	RICHF	IELD		12562434.	12339083.	-223351.
138	2811.	ROBBI	NSDAL	E	39734260.	39712233.	-22028.
139	2821.	ST. A	NTHON	Y-NEW	2804161.	2795794.	-8367.
140	2831.	ST. L	OUIS	PARK	11975795.	11869254.	-106541.
141	2841.	WAYZA	TA		17328447.	17141481.	-186966.
142	2861.	BROOK	LYN C	ENTER	3906850.	3909051.	2201.
143	2941.	HOUST	ON		1399627.	1408779.	9152.
144	2971.	SPRIN	G GRO	VE	1212050.	1212531.	481.
145	2991.	CALED	ONIA		2326376.	2262763.	-63613.
146	3001.	LA CR	ESCEN	T	3402126.	3393665.	-8462.
147	3011.	AKELE	Y		698186.	685382.	-12804.
148	3061.	LAPOR	TE		709417.	730810.	21393.
149	3081.	NEVIS			882422.	870468.	-11954.
150	3091.	PARK	RAPID	S	5594419.	5645374.	50955.

Comparison of Projected 1987-88 Revenues for Minnesota School Districts Based on Current Pupil Unit Weightings and a Potential Weighting of 1.2 Pupil Units for Grades 1-12 and .6 Pupil Unit for Kindergarten

Case Number	District Number	District Name			87-88 Revenue By Current Weightings	87-88 Revenue By Potential Weightings	Change in Revenue
151	3141.	BRAHA	M		2539261.	2574805.	35544.
152	3161.	COLER	AINE		5083395.	5092241.	8846.
153	3171.	DEER	RIVER		3161859.	3215663.	53804.
154	3181.	GRAND	RAPI	DS	13391763.	13412173.	20409.
155	3191.	WASHN	AUK-K	EEWAT	2345876.	2355382.	9505.
156	3232.	FRANC	ONIA		53702.	55613.	1911.
157	3241.	JACKS	ON		2898972.	2947145.	48173.
158	3251.	LAKEF	IELD		1163499.	1144778.	-18721.
159	3281.	SIOUX	VALL	EY	215457.	213596.	-1861.
160	3301.	HERON	LAKE	-OKAB	1012662.	1013607.	945.
161	3321.	MORA			4142365.	4149308.	6943.
162	3331.	OGILV	IE		1582125.	1606696.	24571.
163	3411.	ATWAT	ER		1494458.	1498774.	4315.
164	3451.	NEW L	ONDON	-SPIC	3786163.	3838167.	52005.
165	3461.	RAYMO	ND		780990.	796335.	15345.
166	3471.	WILLM	AR		10141669.	10285977.	144307.
167	3511.	HALLO	CK		930459.	963692.	33233.
168	3521.	MUMBO	LDT-S	T. VI	239039.	239630.	590.
169	3531.	KARLS	TAD		993613.	1002838.	9225.
170	3541.	KENNE	DY		400410.	399799.	-611.
171	3561.	LANCA	STER		502020.	509801.	7781.
172	3611.	INTER	NATIO	NAL F	6210466.	6154243.	-56223.
173	3621.	LITTL	EFORK	-BIG	1154109.	1158228.	4119.
174	3631.	SOUTH	KOOC	HICHI	1138874.	1142748.	3874.
175	3711.	BELLI	NGHAM		502533.	511236.	8703.
176	3761.	MARIE	TTA		302606.	303011.	405.
177	3771.	MADIS	ON		1498123.	1513271.	15149.
178	3781.	DAWSO	N-BOY	D	1825465.	1839345.	13880.
179	3811.	LAKE	SUPER	IOR	6604793.	6645232.	40439.
180	3901.	LAKE	OF TH	E WOO	1719166.	1736029.	16863.
181	3911.	CLEVE	LAND		1164163.	1180612.	16449.
182	3921.	LE CE	NTER		1766770.	1806800.	40030.
183	3931.	LE SU	EUR		2590559.	2552425.	-38134.
184	3941.	MONTG	OMERY	-LONS	2436319.	2407360.	-28959.
185	3951.	WATER	VILLE	-ELYS	2078447.	2111859.	33412.
186	4021.	HENDR	ICKS		507373.	502427.	-4946.
187	4031.	IVANH	OE		950572.	970836.	20264.
188	4041.	LAKE	BENTO	N	697465.	703993.	6527.
189	4081.	VERDI			219206.	231850.	12643.
190	4091.	TYLER			1182100.	1205769.	23669.
191	4111.	BALAT	ON		843917.	855740.	11823.
192	4121.	COTTO	NWOOD		965744.	973361.	7618.
193	4131.	MARSH	ALL		5432559.	5485310.	52751.
194	4141.	MINNE	OTA		1122744.	1110463.	-12281.
195	4151.	LYND			499380.	511434.	12053.
196	4171.	TRACY			2091882.	2074356.	-17526.
197	4181.	RUSSE	LL		501107.	516685.	15578.
198	4211.	BROWN	TON		887430.	886112.	-1318.
199	4221.	GLENC	OE		3444016.	3400858.	-43158.
200	4231.	HUTCH	INSON		6446327.	6411868.	-34459.

Comparison of Projected 1987-88 Revenues for Minnesota School Districts Based on Current Pupil Unit Weightings and a Potential Weighting of 1.2 Pupil Units for Grades 1-12 and .6 Pupil Unit for Kindergarten

Case Number	District Number	District Name			87-88 Revenue By Current Weightings	87-88 Revenue By Potential Weightings	Change in Revenue
201	4241.	LESTE	R PRA	IRIE	1033638.	1049118.	15480.
202	4251.	SILVE	R LAK	E	900369.	844101.	-56268.
203	4261.	STEWA	RT		665093.	675903.	10811.
204	4271.	WINST	ED		500472.	517665.	17193.
205	4321.	MAHNO	MEN		2329597.	2320374.	-9223.
206	4351.	WAUBU	N		1796787.	1799143.	2356.
207	4361.	ALVAR	ADO		389417.	391221.	1804.
208	4371.	ARGYL	E		557919.	537501.	-20417.
209	4401.	MIDDL	E RIV	ER	576196.	573389.	-2807.
210	4411.	NEWFO	LDEN		1190668.	1201521.	10853.
211	4421.	OSLO			325956.	322992.	-2963.
212	4431.	STEPH	EN		829264.	833042.	3777.
213	4441.	STRAN	DQUIS	T	277159.	276436.	-723.
214	4461.	WARRE	N		1620328.	1656952.	36625.
215	4471.	GRYGL	A-GAT	ZKE	930440.	933505.	3065.
216	4511.	CEYLO	N		533321.	529280.	-4040.
217	4531.	EAST	CHAIN		505751.	514443.	8692.
218	4541.	FAIRM	ONT		5556589.	5562488.	5899.
219	4561.	SHERB	URN		1115324.	1120986.	5662.
220	4571.	TRIMO	NT		667589.	670943.	3354.
221	4581.	TRUMA	N		1115465.	1114446.	-1019.
222	4591.	WELCO	ME		700844.	711524.	10680.
223	4601.	GRAHA	DA-HU	NTLEY	750079.	773235.	23156.
224	4611.	COSMO	S		676763.	685205.	8442.
225	4631.	EDEN	VALLE	Y-WAT	2040757.	2060419.	19663.
226	4641.	GROVE	CITY		787518.	803190.	15672.
227	4651.	LITCH	FIELD		5225398.	5240894.	15496.
228	4661.	BASSE	L-COK	ATO	4223234.	4259702.	36467.
229	4731.	ISLE			1250345.	1266030.	15685.
230	4771.	PRINC	ETON		6675684.	6754419.	78735.
231	4801.	ONAMI	A		2078782.	2135331.	56549.
232	4821.	LITTL	E FAL	LS	8570256.	8570330.	74.
233	4831.	MOTLE	Y		1226543.	1238302.	11759.
234	4841.	PIERZ			1907976.	1782122.	-125853.
235	4851.	ROYAL	TON		1910155.	1948839.	38684.
236	4861.	SWANV	ILLE		1078662.	1092325.	13663.
237	4871.	UPSAL	A		1088765.	1111806.	23041.
238	4921.	AUSTI	N		11245616.	11358794.	113178.
239	4951.	GRAND	MEAD	OW	934998.	947091.	12092.
240	4971.	LYLE			678773.	687639.	8866.
241	4991.	LE RO	Y-OST	RANDE	973827.	1008906.	35080.
242	5001.	SOUTH	LAND		1724881.	1721863.	-3018.
243	5041.	SLAYT	ON		1872570.	1894514.	21944.
244	5051.	FULDA			1362827.	1354456.	-8371.
245	5071.	NICOL	LET		894843.	890478.	-4365.
246	5081.	ST. P	ETER		4505384.	4551436.	45852.
247	5111.	ADRIA	N		1401076.	1383735.	-17341.
248	5131.	BREWS	TER		533201.	554541.	21340.
249	5141.	ELLSW	ORTH		484149.	496738.	12589.
250	5161.	ROUND	LAKE		403151.	409074.	5924.

Comparison of Projected 1987-88 Revenues for Minnesota School Districts Based on Current Pupil Unit Weightings and a Potential Weighting of 1.2 Pupil Units for Grades 1-12 and .6 Pupil Unit for Kindergarten

Case Number	District Number	District Name			87-88 Revenue By Current Weightings	87-88 Revenue By Potential Weightings	Change in Revenue
251	5181.	WORTH	INGTO	N	5818169.	5796214.	-21955.
252	5211.	ADA			1460190.	1477721.	17532.
253	5221.	BORUP			362277.	366734.	4457.
254	5231.	GARY			551257.	547029.	-4228.
255	5241.	HALST	AD		441891.	448864.	6973.
256	5251.	HENDR	UM-PE	RLEY	417123.	434693.	17570.
257	5261.	TWIN	VALLE	Y	860761.	860749.	-12.
258	5311.	BYRON			2837992.	2834129.	-3864.
259	5331.	DOVER	-EYOT	A	2015335.	2044073.	28738.
260	5341.	STEWA	RTVIL	LE	4194813.	4205390.	10577.
261	5351.	ROCHE	STER		33441669.	33595800.	154131.
262	5421.	BATTL	E LAK	E	1150704.	1130500.	-20204.
263	5431.	BEER	CREEK		603167.	604455.	1287.
264	5441.	FERGU	S FAL	LS	7487246.	7491947.	4701.
265	5451.	HENNI	NG		1187252.	1183400.	-3852.
266	5471.	PARKE	RS PR	AIRIE	1543575.	1542773.	-802.
267	5481.	PELIC	AN RA	PIDS	2449258.	2481799.	32541.
268	5491.	PERHA	M		3223359.	3211976.	-11383.
269	5501.	UNDER	WOOD		1016295.	1039190.	22894.
270	5531.	NEW Y	ORK M	ILLS	1855426.	1865693.	10267.
271	5611.	GOODR	IDGE		735920.	764140.	28220.
272	5641.	THIEF	RIVE	R FAL	6369145.	6364651.	-4494.
273	5661.	ASKOV			1018615.	1025733.	7118.
274	5701.	FINLA	YSON		624860.	625425.	566.
275	5731.	HINCK	LEY		2093319.	2131428.	38109.
276	5761.	SANDS	TONE		1593549.	1592142.	-1407.
277	5771.	WILLO	W RIV	ER	1122129.	1143406.	21277.
278	5781.	PINE	CITY		3938162.	3989152.	50990.
279	5811.	EDGER	TON		722968.	729283.	6314.
280	5821.	JASPE	R		555717.	557345.	1628.
281	5831.	PIPES	TONE		3063830.	3106638.	42809.
282	5841.	RUTHT	ON		445771.	449413.	3642.
283	5921.	CLINA	X		496672.	507476.	10804.
284	5931.	CROOK	STON		5094810.	5119209.	24398.
285	5951.	EAST	GRAND	FORK	5009411.	5046701.	37290.
286	5971.	ERSKI	NE		509959.	515503.	5545.
287	5991.	FERTI	LE-BE	LTRAM	1459625.	1481300.	21675.
288	6001.	FISHE	R		610003.	612680.	2677.
289	6011.	FOSST	ON		2231063.	2242673.	11610.
290	6031.	MC IN	TOSH		869886.	894567.	24681.
291	6041.	MENTO	R		419764.	421041.	1277.
292	6111.	CYRUS			504531.	504057.	-474.
293	6121.	GLENW	OOD		2628844.	2665686.	36842.
294	6141.	STARB	UCK		1116364.	1122509.	6145.
295	6151.	VILLA	RD		574567.	582234.	7666.
296	6211.	MOUND	S VIE	W	30140840.	30182051.	41211.
297	6221.	NORTH	ST.	PAUL-	21715644.	21910680.	195036.
298	6231.	ROSEV	ILLE		17093564.	17063584.	-29980.
299	6241.	WHITE	BEAR	LAKE	19151256.	19287499.	136243.
300	6251.	ST. P	AUL		94012498.	95088330.	1075832.

C-6

Comparison of Projected 1987-88 Revenues for Minnesota School Districts Based on Current Pupil Unit Weightings and a Potential Weighting of 1.2 Pupil Units for Grades 1-12 and .6 Pupil Unit for Kindergarten

Case Number	District Number	District Name			87-88 Revenue By Current Weightings	87-88 Revenue By Potential Weightings	Change in Revenue
301	6271.	OKLEE			911701.	937496.	25795.
302	6281.	PLUMM	ER		614353.	614831.	478.
303	6301.	RED L	AKE F	ALLS	1195486.	1157908.	-37578.
304	6311.	BELVI	EW		397636.	395886.	-1750.
305	6331.	LAMBE	RTON		699876.	698937.	-939.
306	6351.	MILRO	Y		471841.	481803.	9962.
307	6361.	MORGA	N		738162.	729184.	-8978.
308	6371.	REDWO	OD FA	LLS	3219344.	3259356.	40012.
309	6381.	SANBO	RN		514894.	508570.	-6324.
310	6401.	WABAS	SO		1244598.	1183624.	-60974.
311	6411.	WALNU	T GRO	VE	698409.	702537.	4128.
312	6461.	BIRD	ISLAN	D	902301.	875173.	-27128.
313	6471.	BUFFA	LO LA	KE	592523.	596131.	3608.
314	6481.	DANUB	E		837641.	851081.	13440.
315	6491.	FAIRF	AX		816521.	763415.	-53107.
316	6501.	FRANK	LIN		305163.	308571.	3408.
317	6511.	HECTO	R		971176.	972799.	1623.
318	6521.	HORTO	N		667030.	674748.	7718.
319	6531.	OLIVI	A		1623490.	1604573.	-18917.
320	6541.	REMVI	LLE		980263.	981421.	1157.
321	6551.	SACRE	D HEA	RT	528913.	544073.	15160.
322	6561.	FARIB	AULT		10218968.	10279154.	60185.
323	6571.	MORRI	STOWN		853912.	859881.	5970.
324	6591.	NORTH	FIELD		7682015.	7706938.	24923.
325	6691.	MAGNO	LIA		411222.	410435.	-787.
326	6701.	LUVER	NE		2787268.	2807290.	20022.
327	6711.	HILLS	-BEAV	ER CR	1047738.	1061369.	13632.
328	6761.	BADGE	R		545252.	554927.	9675.
329	6781.	GREEN	BUSH		1094575.	1103536.	8961.
330	6821.	ROSEA	U		3097526.	3122822.	25296.
331	6901.	WARRO	AD		2670426.	2753771.	83345.
332	6911.	AUROR	A-HOY	T LAK	3970897.	3928043.	-42854.
333	6921.	BABBI	TT		2006446.	1993969.	-12477.
334	6931.	BIWAB	IK		1320665.	1323546.	2882.
335	6951.	CHISH	OLM		3405286.	3430017.	24731.
336	6961.	ELY			2515497.	2528584.	13087.
337	6971.	EVELE	TH		3366856.	3356903.	-9953.
338	6981.	FLOOD	WOOD		954928.	948751.	-6177.
339	6991.	GILBE	RT		1615487.	1629714.	14227.
340	7001.	HERMA	NTOWN		3712952.	3708674.	-4278.
341	7011.	HIBBI	NG		10157266.	10145655.	-11611.
342	7041.	PROCT	OR		5860941.	5833416.	-27526.
343	7061.	VIRGI	NIA		5661877.	5679213.	17336.
344	7071.	WETT	LAKE		495097.	505216.	10119.
345	7081.	TOWER	-SOUD	AN	975393.	965970.	-9423.
346	7091.	DULUT	H		40139001.	40531761.	392760.
347	7101.	ST. L	OUIS	COUNT	7851320.	7917068.	65748.
348	7121.	MT.IR	ON-BU	HL	3342810.	3346851.	4040.
349	7161.	BELLE	PLAI	NE	2183179.	2169944.	-13235.
350	7171.	JORDA	N		2835347.	2820486.	-14860.

Comparison of Projected 1987-88 Revenues for Minnesota School Districts
Based on Current Pupil Unit Weightings and a Potential Weighting of
1.2 Pupil Units for Grades 1-12 and .6 Pupil Unit for Kindergarten

Case Number	District Number	District Name			87-88 Revenue By Current Weightings	87-88 Revenue By Potential Weightings	Change in Revenue
351	7191.	PRIOR	LAKE		7870336.	7753066.	-117270.
352	7201.	SHAKO	PEE		6526028.	6501405.	-24623.
353	7211.	NEW P	RAGUE		4486735.	4395001.	-91734.
354	7261.	BECKE	R		2092361.	2136893.	44532.
355	7271.	BIG L	AKE		3002109.	3005417.	3307.
356	7281.	ELK R	IVER		14148715.	14243992.	95277.
357	7311.	ARLIN	GTON		1878784.	1878784.	0.
358	7321.	GAYLO	RD		1552447.	1553975.	1528.
359	7331.	GIBBO	N		591134.	600952.	9817.
360	7341.	HENDE	RSON		739905.	747594.	7689.
361	7351.	WINTH	ROP		1128792.	1141968.	13176.
362	7361.	BELGR	ADE		1439319.	1456818.	17499.
363	7371.	BROOT	EN		1116008.	1126829.	10820.
364	7381.	HOLDI	NGFOR	D	2677220.	2746280.	69060.
365	7391.	KIMBA	LL		2108158.	2141540.	33382.
366	7401.	MELRO	SE		3407830.	3261811.	-146019.
367	7411.	PAYNE	SVILL	E	3287484.	3349821.	62337.
368	7421.	ST. C	LOUD		27183542.	27119124.	-64417.
369	7431.	SAUK	CENTR	E	2935823.	2784707.	-151116.
370	7451.	ALBAN	Y		3822376.	3810365.	-12011.
371	7481.	SARTE	LL		3957194.	4021784.	64590.
372	7501.	COLD	SPRIN	G	4836723.	4752335.	-84388.
373	7561.	BLOOM	ING P	RAIRI	2342390.	2367385.	24995.
374	7611.	ONATO	NNA		10479528.	10567732.	88205.
375	7621.	ELLEN	DALE-	GENEV	1079169.	1091894.	12725.
376	7631.	MEDFO	RD		1354096.	1379047.	24951.
377	7681.	HANCO	CK		774201.	785184.	10983.
378	7691.	MORRI	S		2728885.	2739909.	11023.
379	7711.	CHOKI	O-ALB	ERTA	768275.	781053.	12778.
380	7751.	KERKH	OVEN-	MURDO	1601325.	1618592.	17267.
381	7771.	BENSO	N		2944003.	2949805.	5802.
382	7841.	APPLE	TON		1748394.	1765069.	16675.
383	7861.	BERTH	A-HEW	ITT	1475452.	1492996.	17543.
384	7871.	BROWE	RVILL	E	1052903.	1018170.	-34734.
385	7891.	CLARI	SSA		866735.	868376.	1640.
386	7901.	EAGLE	BEND		915465.	925451.	9986.
387	7911.	GREY	EAGLE		798962.	814202.	15240.
388	7921.	LONG	PRAIR	IE	2723459.	2685971.	-37488.
389	7931.	STAPL	ES		4069866.	4057157.	-12709.
390	8011.	BROWN	S VAL	LEY	379187.	390293.	11106.
391	8031.	WHEAT	ON		1497817.	1499126.	1309.
392	8061.	ELBIN	-HILL	VILLE	1295911.	1302740.	6829.
393	8091.	HAZEP	PA		806562.	832065.	25503.
394	8101.	PLAIN	VIEW		2382068.	2403900.	21832.
395	8111.	WABAS	HA		2067792.	2035865.	-31927.
396	8131.	LAKE	CITY		3397959.	3383255.	-14704.
397	8152.	PRINS	BURG		30695.	31875.	1180.
398	8181.	VERND	ALE		1086756.	1099998.	13242.
399	8191.	WADEN	A		3310563.	3288988.	-21574.
400	8201.	BEBEK	A		1698853.	1712945.	14093.

Comparison of Projected 1987-88 Revenues for Minnesota School Districts
Based on Current Pupil Unit Weightings and a Potential Weighting of
1.2 Pupil Units for Grades 1-12 and .6 Pupil Unit for Kindergarten

Case Number	District Number	District Name			87-88 Revenue By Current Weightings	87-88 Revenue By Potential Weightings	Change in Revenue
401	8211.	MENAH	GA		1649372.	1687707.	38335.
402	8271.	NEW R	ICHLA	ND-HA	1392070.	1409143.	17073.
403	8291.	WASEC	A		5515457.	5570543.	55086.
404	8301.	JAMES	VILLE		1458071.	1459474.	1403.
405	8311.	FORES	T LAK	E	16560715.	16555018.	-5697.
406	8321.	MAHTO	MEDI		4625044.	4666836.	41791.
407	8331.	SOUTH	WASH	INGTO	24848989.	25207653.	358664.
408	8341.	STILL	WATER		20341519.	20219937.	-121582.
409	8361.	BUTTE	RFIEL	D	641315.	633381.	-7934.
410	8371.	MADEL	IA		1589219.	1565509.	-23711.
411	8401.	ST. J	AMES		3022313.	3061455.	39142.
412	8461.	BRECK	ENRID	GE	2651418.	2649926.	-1492.
413	8501.	ROTHS	AY		562545.	568933.	6389.
414	8521.	CAMPB	ELL-T	INTAH	612837.	620562.	7726.
415	8571.	LEWIS	TON		1914695.	1909858.	-4837.
416	8581.	ST. C	HARLE	S	2385951.	2431062.	45110.
417	8611.	WINON	A		12233893.	12310089.	76196.
418	8761.	ANNAN	DALE		3864030.	3908461.	44430.
419	8771.	BUFFA	LO		9449183.	9523905.	74722.
420	8791.	BELAN	O		3501736.	3439999.	-61736.
421	8801.	HOWAR	D LAK	E-WAV	2227038.	2200508.	-26530.
422	8811.	MAPLE	LAKE		1799499.	1799817.	318.
423	8821.	MONTI	CELLO		6682962.	6684853.	1891.
424	8831.	ROCKF	ORD		3507016.	3558082.	51066.
425	8851.	ST. M	ICHAE	L-ALB	2731706.	2730275.	-1431.
426	8911.	CANBY			1832734.	1828707.	-4027.
427	8921.	CLARK	FIELD		927996.	949507.	21511.
428	8931.	ECHO			330461.	329156.	-1305.
429	8941.	GRANI	TE FA	LLS	2396186.	2411466.	15280.
430	8961.	WOOD	LAKE		349650.	351003.	1353.
431	9111.	CAMBR	IDGE		9238690.	9313491.	74801.
432	9121.	MILAC	A		4209310.	4247147.	37837.
433	9131.	WALDO	RF-PE	MBERT	931323.	960601.	29278.
434	9141.	ULEN-	HITTE	RDAL	1095358.	1114040.	18483.
435	9181.	CHAND	LER-L	AKE W	702528.	707566.	5038.

STATE TOTALS:

Current Weightings: $1,878,186,759

Potential Weightings: $1,889,579,795

Change in Revenue: $11,393,036